

Vol. I.

APRIL, 1880.

No. 2.

THE

CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIAN

QUARTERLY.

EDITED BY THE

Theological Faculty of Cumberland University.

FIRST SERIES, VOL. XVI.
SECOND SERIES, VOL. XI.

LEBANON, TENN.:
REV. J. D. KIRKPATRICK.

CONTENTS.

I. The Mosaic Jurisprudence. By Hon. R. C. EWING, Sherman, Texas.....	129
II. Baptismal Regeneration—Part 2. By S. G. BURNEY, D.D., Lebanon, Tenn.....	160
III. The Ethics of St. Paul. By WM. CAMPBELL, D.D., Niles, Ohio.....	196
IV. Sanctification. By J. W. POINDEXTER, D.D., Sherman, Texas.....	208
V. Literary Notices.....	246





THE QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1880.

ART. I.—THE MOSAIC JURISPRUDENCE.

It is believed that the body of the laws promulgated by Moses were generally observed by the Jews from the period of the exodus till their final expulsion from the land of Palestine and dispersion throughout the world, but their forms of government and methods of administering the law, underwent so many changes, and were at different times so materially modified, that it was no longer the government of Moses; and hence we propose to limit this discussion strictly within the period of the Hebrew Commonwealth—to the time when pious old Samuel declared the end of the Mosaic rule, proclaimed the kingdom, and anointed a king.

There can be no conception of an organized community, without the concomitants of law and power to enforce obedience. Government, in its original form, involved the idea of a right in some man, or in a body of men, not only to make a law but to enforce it; and in all the early governments the law-maker was also the administrator of the law. Just at this point will be found the widest divergence between ancient and modern systems of jurisprudence. The principle of a separate tribunal to administer the law without legislative or executive authority, was developed and applied in modern civilization.

It is the accepted theory that the claim of one man to require the respect and obedience of another, was first set up in the family government. The basis of the authority of the parent during the period of minority, lies in the position, wants, and necessities of the children. Without referring to the divine sanction of such a doctrine, we may find it

supported by the natural instincts of all animal creation. It is equally supported by the plainest rules of natural justice and reason. The obligations upon the parents and children are reciprocal, and the duty of obedience arises out of the relation which confers the authority. In the earliest periods of society it was not the habit of the children to leave the parental roof so soon as they attained the years of manhood, but they remained perhaps during the whole lifetime of the father; if not members of the same household, at least in the same community and tribe. In this way many families would become united in a common brotherhood; and thus the tribal relation was instituted and the tribal government organized. Perhaps other families, from social considerations or for purposes of mutual protection, would seek admission into the incipient tribe; and when a chief or governor was needed for the new community, the old patriarch, remarkable for his years and esteemed for his wisdom, would be tacitly or expressly promoted to that position. During the period that long life was the inheritance of man, several generations, even of the same family, would be brought under this primitive form of government; and this system was finally adapted to the nomadic habits of the early families of the race. As we progress, we expect to show that men generally, in every part of the world, desired laws and governments suitable to their condition. Under the tribal system of government, with the strong tie of blood between the governor and the subjects, we may well suppose that the laws were eminently paternal and benignant; and these paternal rules of conduct would be extended to all strangers adopted into the tribe. This would occur, not only for the sake of uniformity in the application of the laws to all alike, but because of the instinctive sense of natural justice which belongs to all men, who are not wholly perverted from their original standard of rectitude. This tribal government would suffice so long as the nomadic habits prevailed; but when men descended into the rich valleys of the great and beautiful rivers, and found a virgin soil teeming with the natural fruits of the earth, and found also that nature was prompt and lavish in

her response to even the rudest form of culture, then they became permanent denizens of the land, and required a different form of government. The aggregation of great numbers of people, from divers tribes and communities, necessitated the cultivation of the soil and established trade and commerce among men. These conditions demanded a new and vigorous government, and some ambitious Napoleon was found equal to the occasion, and won his right to rule by war and conquest. We predicate this statement of pre-historic times upon the analogy of subsequent history. Every community in the old world has been at one time or another a battle-field to determine the right of men to rule over their fellows. But a man's authority once established and recognized by his people, the first subject of consideration was the laws for their government. Apart from a lust for power and an ambition to rule, there is inherent in every human being, more or less well defined, a sense of natural justice—a sense of what is right between man and man; and this sentiment is the source of all good laws, and it is the foundation of many stable governments in the world. Men submit to authority for personal ends, and unless their rights are in a measure secured and protected by government, they will rise in rebellion *en masse*. Hence rulers, from necessity and policy, would follow the natural promptings of hearts not wholly bad, and enact beneficial laws for the government of their people. Excepting a few fanatics, as between his subjects, a ruler can have no choice. He is either concerned or indifferent alike to all. It is under these conditions that even in the rudest ages, we find sound rules of law emanating from the source of power. And herein is corroboration of the proposition above submitted, that the sense of justice natural to the human heart is the prolific source of all good law and government.

The desire of protection from a power stronger than ourselves, begets the idea that obligations are reciprocal. A man who invokes the aid of others, must himself be willing to render similar aid whenever called upon. It is an old maxim that law is founded on the necessities of mankind, and the original character of all human laws will be

found to be according to the extent of the prevalence of the sentiment of natural justice among the governed and the governor. The difference in the systems of jurisprudence which have obtained among civilized peoples, will be rather in degree than in kind. It is submitted as a general proposition, certainly not universal, that the laws of a given community are but the crystallization of the public sentiment of the people. Whatever a given number of men would esteem to be right and just as between themselves, would serve as a rule for all the people; and this general opinion would after awhile become a rule of decision where a controversy should arise. This was certainly the method by which those two grandest of all systems of jurisprudence, the common law and the civil law, grew up into proportions that embraced nearly all the people in the world. It will be borne in mind that there were no parliaments or legislatures in the old world to ordain and promulgate laws. Indeed, I venture the assertion that the best and most extensive systems of laws known to our race, were the product of the public sentiment of the people, and they acquired the force of law long before there were any legislative bodies. Where the power of the sovereign was absolute, his decree might be a law so long as he chose to let it stand; but he could declare it one day and revoke it the next.

I desire to explain that in speaking of law as it prevailed in the old world, it is to be understood only as it applied to the people in their relations to each other. That the subject of any government had any rights against the crown was never recognized. This is a doctrine of modern growth.

The conviction which prevails in the minds of men, that there is such a thing as justice and right to be observed towards each other, is a remnant of that divine sentiment implanted in the human heart at man's creation. The carnival of crime and death which has reigned among men through all the ages, has not entirely obliterated it. The idea of justice is God-given, and is found exemplified only in the intelligent portion of creation; nor is it pretended that this sentiment prevails with equal force among all

peoples who have not the light of divine revelation. Just how it happens that one race of people will achieve grand results in law, government, art, and science, while another grovels in the densest darkness, and both equally removed from the source of all true knowledge, is a problem not now under discussion, and if it were, we should confess our inability to render a satisfactory solution. The true reason for this inequality among the nations of the earth before the Christian era, would be an inquiry of surpassing interest. I have never yet seen anything in my limited reading that was at all satisfactory on the subject.

The little we know of the social systems of the old monarchies of the East, will not justify an attempt to analyze very critically their codes of criminal and civil jurisprudence. We state the general proposition that their forms of government vested legislative, executive, and judicial powers in the sovereign, and that the rights of the subject against the crown were not recognized, as heretofore stated; but as between the subjects, the private rights of parties were distinctly marked and in general fairly exacted. To this conclusion we must come, judging from the wealth and power attained by these old governments. A people ground between the upper and nether mill-stones, could not build great cities, acquire great wealth, become very numerous, and supply men and subsistence for immense armies, not only for home protection, but for invasion and conquest. These results were found in the histories of many of the old monarchies of the East. Self-interest, a desire to enhance the wealth and power of his kingdom, would furnish a motive for a beneficent rule to any one not a monster in human form. And when a people became very great and very powerful, with strong armies and much substance, accompanied by all the aids and concomitants of wealth, prestige, and national influence, we may fairly conclude that such a people were wisely and well governed. And this beneficent government could only result from formulating into permanent rules the principles of natural justice which are found deep down in the consciousness of all men. When we speak of good government among the ancients, the

reader will bear in mind that what would be esteemed wise and beneficent for a rude age and an ignorant people, would not be such for those who live under the blazing light of the nineteenth century. The difference would be found to consist more in the recognition of the rights of the citizen against the government and in the modes of administering the law, than in the rules which defined the private rights of the people, for these rules are unchangeable and eternal in their nature, and have prevailed in all ages and among all civilized peoples. God wrote the principles of sound law upon human hearts long before he wrote the decalogue on tables of stone. Man was created with all his divine faculties of mind and heart long before Moses saw the smoking summit of Sinai or heard the thunder from its hoary brow. The God-given intellect of man was impaired, but not destroyed, by the palsyng power of sin. The great powers of the mind survived the wreck of his moral nature, and some of the grandest achievements known to all history were accomplished among a people upon whom the light of revelation never fell. The sublimest spectacle ever presented by human history is that of a brave people nobly fighting their way out of ignorance and darkness, without the aid of divine revelation, up to the great heights of a pyramid of human knowledge.

The rules of law enunciated in the decalogue, leaving out all those appertaining to the worship of the true God, were but a reproduction of those eternal rules of right, which had obtained in a greater or less degree among all civilized peoples, long before and immediately anterior to the Mosaic history.

This view will be more satisfactorily seen upon a further inquiry into the systems of jurisprudence which obtained within historic times, but in countries which were unknown to the Jews, and of course could have derived no benefit from contact with a people who were governed under a divine commission.

The oldest government now existing, or perhaps that ever existed in the world, and which has been perpetuated down through the ages, antedating the Jewish Theocracy by seven

centuries and the Christian era by twenty-two, is that of China. A change of dynasty in the rulers has taken place from time to time, but the integrity of the empire has remained intact. Judging of the laws of the Chinese by the stability of their government, we must conclude that their foundation is laid in the very perfection of human wisdom. The Jewish Theocracy was established by divine authority, and their rules of government promulgated with the divine sanction, and that people have been scattered to the four winds for centuries past, and yet a greater number of human beings acknowledge Confucius as a law-giver than believe in Christ. The great moral teacher and legal luminary, "the instructor of ten thousand ages," as Confucius is pompously styled in Chinese literature, has been a sun in mid-heaven to that people for revolving cycles and rolling centuries. It is certainly true that some of his maxims of morals are nearly equivalent, if not absolutely identical in spirit, with the teachings of Christ himself. The wisdom of his laws and rules of government and the soundness of his morals, are abundantly established by a simple reference to the duration and stability of the empire. Whence did this great pagan derive his super-eminent wisdom? Whence the secret of the power which has solidified and maintained a government over one-third of the human race for centuries upon centuries? To my mind, there is but one answer, and that is, the great Creator of all men bestowed such endowments of mind and heart upon Confucius as qualified him for his immortal destiny—that principles, unchangeable in their character and eternal in their duration, were implanted deep down in his nature, and when developed for practical use, were found adapted to all times and countries and peoples. He became a great law-giver and teacher of morals from the exhaustless resources of his own broad heart and teeming intellect. For Moses, God wrote the law on tables of stone; for Confucius and other ancient rulers, he wrote the same law, ages before, on the human heart. After the sin and fall of Adam, man was not abandoned of God and left to his own feeble devices for the care of himself and the government of the millions of earth.

The great designs of the Almighty in the creation of intelligent beings to inhabit this earth will not be defeated by the machinations of the devil and the weakness of the first parents. Although it required redemption by the Son of God to bring men back to what was lost in the fall, yet they were not wholly given over to the power of the evil one anterior to the period of a full revelation of that redemption. God still held the reins which guided and controlled the hearts of rulers, and upon occasion gave to those hearts a divine impulse that developed into sound law and wise government, otherwise the whole race would have been overwhelmed in debauchery and corruption, and sunk so utterly low as to be beyond the reach of salvation.

We may learn a lesson from Japanese history similar to that of the Chinese, but we will not dwell on that.*

Egypt became a great and powerful nation, and must have been governed with comparative beneficence and wisdom, otherwise the results of greatness and power could not have been attained. Judging from the dealings of Pharaoh with the children of Israel, it cannot be pretended that any Hebrew favorite of the king had any appreciable influence in the formation of the laws or in their administration. So it was properly a pagan power. Joseph had no successor, in the extent of his influence, in the court of Egyptian kings, and even his influence was principally exerted in the protection of the people of his own race, rather than in the modification of the laws of the kingdom.

But for the purposes of this discussion, it is not necessary to dwell longer on the old and dead monarchies of the East. In many of them were found extraordinary evidences of wealth and power—of all those elements which go to consti-

* It will be understood by the reader that I do not claim Confucius to have been a law-giver and civil ruler in the ordinary sense. He was the great moral teacher of his people, and they had such a profound reverence for him and his teachings, that his maxims of morals became incorporated into the practical administration of the government, and into the system of laws defining private rights, simply by the process of absorption into the public sentiment of the country. In the same manner the teachings of Christ, although not pretending to lay down a code of laws for men, have become assimilated into the jurisprudence and civilization of all Christian countries.

tute a strong and enlightened government; one that could not exist without wise and beneficent laws and a paternal protection of the property and rights of the masses of the people.

We take up a line of history that is replete with the grandest achievements of human genius, and that glows on every page with the electric light of intellectual brightness, and is burdened with exhibitions of human greatness and power, is covered all over with a halo of enchantment and romance, such as the world has never seen before nor since. The Greek is a stupendous intellectual wonder. Self-taught, self-evolved, with no aids but a feeble light reflected from the banks of the Nile, he brought himself up to a grander height in knowledge and intellectual power than any predecessor, contemporary, or successor. In the matter of original thought, in science, literature, law and government, he stands alone and unapproached by the people of any other country under the sun. An important reason for this extraordinary development may be found in the social customs and institutions of the people. Perhaps no race of people in the world ever talked so much or so well. Logic, to the Greek mind, was a natural inheritance. Daily discussions on law and government, the practice of oral instruction by the wise and learned to the young, the friction of mind with mind, the ambitious desire for fame and public position, the arena of politics and the forum of justice; in short, all the conditions of democratic institutions furnished the Greek with opportunities for intellectual development which no other forms of society could have done.

Greek jurisprudence, as developed in Athens, is a model of wisdom and adaptation to a democratic form of government. For the first time in European history, we find here a judiciary separated from the law-making power; though certain executive duties, in addition to the judicial, were devolved on the judge. We find, also, a legislative power distinct from the executive. The right of appeal was allowed from the subordinate to the higher courts. And generally we find all the elements usually employed in modern states for preserving social order and protecting the

private rights of the people. But we find, also, another very marked exhibition of those eternal principles of justice which prevailed in older and contemporaneous governments. The imperial democracy of Athens could not improve on those principles of right which emanated from the source of all justice.

After all, the boasted improvements of modern civilization relate more to the machinery for administering the law, more to the forms of adaptation to new and changing conditions of society, than to the principles of the law. These principles are unchangeable. They are of divine origin, and organized society is called upon simply to apply them to the daily transactions and affairs of the people in the great commercial era of the world's history.

It has been the fashion among certain historians to deny the pretensions of Greek statesmanship, never stopping to reflect that the very nature of the democratic institutions under which his statesmanship was formed, precluded his qualification to organize and carry on a strong and compact government of similar model to the Roman empire. A democracy is necessarily and essentially vacilating and weak, and it does not develop statesmanship for empire. But, whether a statesman or not, he did well in his place; he was a born thinker; he was a philosopher, a poet, an orator, and an artist. "Among the Greeks, all the flowers of genius bloomed together; their poets, their sculptors, their philosophers, their historians, have been down to our day, and will be hereafter, the guides and the models of the men of taste and intelligence in all ages and in all countries." Thus is our estimate of Greek character and achievements corroborated by a late accomplished and elegant French author; and I believe this sentiment is general with all educated people. And yet all this perfection in law, government, literature, and art, was achieved by the Hellenic race without a single ray of light which flashed from the brow of Sinai, and which became a burning torch to the wandering Jews.

In speaking of the Greeks, we have confined ourselves to the type as developed by the Athenian democracy, not

stopping now to discuss the peculiar jurisprudence of other Grecian states. Before dismissing this point, we desire to bring out more prominently the fact that in this history we have the first intelligent and successful attempt by men to govern themselves. They employed all the elements of a good government—a legislative power, a separate judiciary and executive authority, and the right of appeal from the lower courts. We cannot judge of the wisdom of a system of jurisprudence unless we could know precisely the conditions of society which prevailed where the laws were enforced. Exact adaptationⁿ to the wants and necessities of the people in framing government and laws is the perfection of human wisdom. We cannot compare the Greek executive and judicial machinery with that of this country, because the conditions of society are wholly dissimilar. The practical operation of rules of law and government affords the truest test of their wisdom and adaptability to the wants and conditions of the people. When, therefore, we find an unprecedented and unparalleled degree of prosperity in a given community, both individual and national, there we may conclude that the laws are beneficent and wisely administered. The application of this test affords us a better view of the jurisprudence of any people than a critical analysis of their system, and for the reason already stated, that at this distance of time we cannot judge of the wisdom of the ancient methods of carrying on the government and protecting the private rights of the people. We will remember to make the application of this test, both as to the governments already named and those to be mentioned hereafter.

The transition from Greece to Rome in this discussion is both natural and easy. Following our inclination, we could exhaust the space allowed us for this article, in presenting the civil law of Rome as the most comprehensive system of law ever elaborated and educed from the rubbish of the ages for the wants of human society. I set out with a quotation from Chancellor Kent upon this point. He says: "The civil law was created and gradually matured on the banks of the Tiber by the successive wisdom of Roman statesmen, sages, and magistrates, and after governing the greatest people in

the ancient world for the space of thirteen or fourteen centuries, and undergoing extraordinary vicissitudes after the fall of the Western Empire, it was revived, admired, and studied in modern Europe on account of the variety and excellence of its general principles. It is now taught and obeyed not only in France, Spain, Germany, Holland, and Scotland, but in the islands of the Indian Ocean, and on the banks of the Mississippi and St. Lawrence. The genius of the Roman government and people had displayed itself by the time of the expulsion of their kings and the foundation of their best institutions and discipline had been laid." Thus speaks one of the great legal luminaries of this continent. It is high praise from a high source. But the attention of the reader is especially called to the declaration that the civil law received its foundation and acquired its principle volume long before the period of the Christian era. We shall have a use for this further on. During the period of the Republic the civil law was greatly expanded to suit the new conditions of society; systematized and formulated into permanent rules, and finally codified and published in the shape of the Twelve Tables. It is claimed by some and denied by others, that in the final preparation of the code by the *decemvirs*, a commission was sent to Greece to study their system of jurisprudence, and that much of the wisdom of Greek law is incorporated into the Roman. The weight of authority seems to be in favor of the commission; and if it be true, it is no disparagement to the Roman that he sought light from an older and better civilization than his own.

In examining the Twelve Tables, we find many of their provisions extremely crude, but the science of government and law was then in its infancy. The great difficulty lay in framing the machinery for carrying on the government and administering the law. In the absence of light from other nations, this was to be accomplished by the slow process of experiment; the trial of this or that method was the test of its wisdom and adaptability to the end proposed. By this means they worked upward and onward.

Of the civil law as it was finally codified and published as the Pandects by a commission of lawyers, under the

authority of the Emperor Justinian, Judge Kent says: "With all its errors and imperfections, the Pandects are the greatest repository of sound legal principles applied to the private rights and business of mankind that has ever appeared in any age or nation." Justinian has given it the remarkable appellation of the "Temple of human justice."

Judge Kent makes the same criticism on the civil law that I have made in reference to the jurisprudence of older governments—that as against the state, the rights of the people were not established or even recognized. He says "that the value of the civil law is not to be found in questions which relate to the connection between the government and the people, or in provisions for personal security in criminal cases." The complete recognition of the doctrine that the citizen had rights against the state, was not accomplished till the English-speaking races asserted it; though it was not achieved by them till after centuries of struggle with kingly prerogatives.

But before we leave this branch of our discussion, let us take a brief resurvey of what Roman law and government were—what they accomplished in human affairs and in human history. Has the reader ever stopped long enough to take in the full scope of what Roman history comprises?

In the age of the early Cæsars the rulers of Rome sat upon the most colossal throne known to human history. They stood upon the grandest pyramid of power the world ever saw. The sovereign could point his scepter to all the civilized inhabitants of three continents (except Eastern Asia) and command obedience. A hundred and twenty millions of people acknowledged their fealty to Cæsar. Roman jurisprudence expanded until it covered, as with a shield, the subjects of the remotest provinces. It was a government of power. Its arm had smitten down every foe and conquered every enemy. Wealth and material prosperity crowned the people and filled the coffers of the rulers; and all these splendid achievements were the work of human genius and human valor. This grand superstructure of laws and government was constructed and reared by human agency, and without the aid of divine revelation.

However man's moral nature may have been warped and distorted by sin, and however much his intellectual faculties may have been impaired by the same cause, yet sufficient remained from the grand wreck to enable him to dazzle the world by the splendor of his achievements. By the friction of mind with mind (which could only occur after the nomadic mode of life had been abandoned), by the contests for supremacy natural to the human mind, by the aid of long experience and observation, and by the habit of going down into one's own consciousness and evolving therefrom the great principles of natural justice, men became competent to the task of building and maintaining a great government. Nor did they confine themselves to law and politics. They developed science, cultivated the fine arts, and became great orators and lawyers, statesmen and rulers, long before the Christian era. We may gather a fine lesson from these old histories of the benign influence exerted on human society when the people had the right to participate in the making and administration of the law. As hinted at in another place, it was only under such conditions that law at first acquired any degree of stability, and separate tribunals were erected to enforce the law. Men called upon to devise measures for their own benefit, and that of their neighbors also, would naturally be honest with themselves. They would be anxious to invoke the wisest and best means of accomplishing a given end. There could be no motive to enact laws that would be grievous to the citizen and burdensome to the state. Hence we find that the best laws of Greece and the finest principles of the civil law were developed and formulated into permanent rules while the voice of the people was the supreme authority. The example of the Greek law in separating the law-making from the judicial power, was followed by the civil law. The *Prætor* was a judge in the present sense of that term, and appeal was allowed from his judgments; and although he announced from the bench rules of law (in cases where there was no precedent) which had no previous authority, yet that ruling was but the echo of the prevailing public sentiment of the people, just as it was done in the early period of the

common law by our cousins across the water. The rulings of the courts in all civilized countries where there is no precedent to serve as a guide to the judge, and all general legislation where bodies for that purpose exist, are but the evidences of what the general sentiment of the people is upon those subjects. The concurrent testimony of a whole community as to the policy or expediency of a given measure, is a sufficient justification to a court or a legislator to follow in that direction.

To them the voice of the people is the voice of God, especially if it be the "sober second thought," which is said to be always right.

Although the Pandects were compiled in a Christian age and under a partial Christian influence, it cannot be pretended that the laws were framed under any other than pagan influence. The civil law acquired its largest proportions and finest outlines in the Augustan age, and long before Christianity was a recognized power among the Roman people. After Constantine became a professed believer in the Christian religion, there is a bare possibility that a slight influence was brought to bear upon some of the rigors of the criminal law, in so far as it affected the relations of the citizen to the state; but the body of the Pandects was but a compilation of rules of law and judgments of courts which were in form for centuries before the recognition of Christianity by any of the law-making and law-dispensing powers of the Roman Empire.

But we must not dwell upon this branch of our discussion. It is a fascinating subject, and it has almost the same charms for us now that it had in our college days. Our reading of the civil law has been as a lawyer and not as a student of Roman classics. Hence we claim to be able to pass a severer judgment upon a rule of law found in the civil code, than we could on a passage of Cicero or Virgil.

We pass now to a very brief consideration of the rise of the common law of England. It may be claimed at the outset that this system of jurisprudence was framed under the influence of a Christian civilization, and we admit it to be true to a very limited extent. The Christian influences

which prevailed during the formative period of the unwritten law of England were very feeble and partial; so much so, indeed, that it can scarcely be claimed that it exerted any material influence in moulding the legal institutions of the country. There is one branch of English jurisprudence of comparatively recent origin, which was introduced into the country and incorporated into permanent rules of equity by ecclesiastics educated at Rome; but even these rules, which form the basis of English equity jurisprudence, were of Roman-pagan origin, although carried over to the British Island by Catholic priests. The common law in its technical signification had no equity. It was a system of iron rules, without flexibility and without universal adaptation to the multifarious affairs of every-day life. The Catholic priests, educated at Rome and taught in the learning of the civil law, were the first chancellors in the judiciary system of England, and they gave to equity jurisprudence its organic principles, and these principles were taken from the civil law and were of pagan origin. They laid the foundation of the finest and most beneficent branch of civil law known to English-speaking peoples. Society could not exist now in this country without the aid of equity rules of decision, and courts to administer that branch of our law. English law-writers are reluctant to admit that their great system of law is indebted for contributions to any other country, but it is true nevertheless, and American law-writers are free to acknowledge it. But this is foreign to our main line of thought, only in so far as it may show how far a pagan country contributed acceptable rules of equity jurisprudence for a Christian nation. The unwritten law of England took its origin at so remote a period that it is difficult to determine with any accuracy how far Christian influences prevailed in giving it shape and consistency; but the careful reader of English history will recall at once that religion was a feeble power in Great Britain long after her jurisprudence was well defined and well administered.

After writing thus far, we came across a passage in Prescott's "History of the Conquest of Mexico," which is a fine illustration of a point we shall presently make, and we will

introduce it here, although it should properly stand beside the reference made to China, and her great law-giver. Speaking of the Aztecs, Mr. Prescott says "that their code of laws, though stamped with the prestige of a rude people, evinced a profound respect for the great principles of morality. Their military usages had a remarkable resemblance to those of the early Romans, and their political institutions denoted a degree of civilization not much short of that enjoyed by the Anglo-Saxons under Alfred the Great. I think their legal code might bear a favorable comparison with much that is found in the Twelve Tables of Roman law. Their superior judges were wholly independent of the monarch—held their office for life and were supported by the produce of the crown lands."

Now, where and of whom did the Aztecs, away in far off America, learn the great principles of morality and law, and a judiciary independent of the monarch? Why this is modern civilization! Is there any solution to this problem of advanced morality and civilization among American aborigines, except in the great truth that God reigns and holds in his hands the hearts and destinies of men? The same Almighty Power which created the Chinaman, the Egyptian, the Persian, the Greek, the Roman, and the Aztec, has implanted in the hearts of each and all of them the same eternal principles of right and justice, and these same principles are wonderfully exhibited in the civil institutions of all these different races.

We thus present a rapid survey of the systems of jurisprudence which prevailed in the leading kingdoms and republics of the world anterior to and contemporaneous with the Jewish Commonwealth. We now propose to contrast the several systems of law which prevailed in the countries whose history we have considered with the Mosaic jurisprudence, and by this comparison we propose to bring out the fact that the government of Moses was not a daily, standing, monumental miracle, except in the matter of the punishment visited on the people by God himself on account of their idolatry. In other words, we propose to show that Moses was a man and that he devised a government for men

like himself—that his civil administration was practically the same, and no better, than that of other nations. While the children of Jacob were an eminently favored people, yet they were men and only men, notwithstanding the high destiny to which they had been chosen; but being men, and very wicked men at that, they had to be governed by laws adapted to their condition; and their great law-giver, although divinely inspired, could only lay down those same immutable rules of right and those same principles of justice which we have seen were promulgated by other rulers, and which were crystalized into permanent rules of law and government among many other peoples.

It will be borne in mind that the divine hand was employed in the punishment of the Jews only when they became idolatrous, and disloyal to the God who had delivered them from the condition of bondmen and slaves; and in such cases it was God's punishment and not that of Moses. But before we enter upon an analysis of the Mosaic code, it may assist our investigations to go back a little and learn as far as we may, the exact mental and moral features of Jewish society at the time Moses was called to enter upon his great work; for, as we have already stated, the wisdom of any given code of laws is to be determined by the condition and wants of the people who are to be brought under it. What would have been a wise government for the Jews in the days of Moses, would be a very inadequate one for a Christian commonwealth in the nineteenth century.

The descendants of Jacob had been in Egypt over four hundred years at the date of the exodus. They had multiplied and grown up under Egyptian despotism until they numbered more than six hundred thousand men twenty years old. Just how far the worship of the true God was maintained during this long period, and how far that worship tended to mould the religious character of that people, we cannot determine with accuracy. It must be true beyond question, that a great majority of the Israelites when they set out from Egypt were idolaters. Their repeated lapses into idol-worship in the wilderness demonstrated the powerful influence that

contact with Egyptian idolatry had left on the Hebrew mind. Even God's chosen high priest was not beyond the evil influence of his idolatrous kinsmen. For centuries they had been surrounded by all the forms and insignia of idolatrous worship as it was practiced among the Egyptians, and patronized and upheld by the royal authority. It is no wonder to me that the average Hebrew, after his long residence among a nation of idolaters, became himself as one of them; and this cause of wonder ceases entirely when we study the character of the Hebrew, and find him to be of the most rebellious, obstinate, and stiff-necked race known in all history. In these latter characteristics he stands without a parallel in the world of human beings. This conclusion is fortified by the history of the race from the exodus till the present day. In these respects, no vicissitudes of fortune, change of government, captivity, or a condition of comparative freedom under their own rulers, or dispersion among all the nations of the earth, have sufficed to change his nature or character. He is still the same impracticable Jew. We state further, that the Hebrews in the time of Moses were a very ignorant and debased people. They had existed for centuries under the yoke of a hard master—there was no education or general diffusion of intelligence among the masses. We also find them, once emancipated from the yoke of their foreign masters, turbulent, intolerant, unruly, and ungrateful to the last degree. During the weary march through the wilderness they were in a state of incipient, and often open, rebellion. They could not be made to understand and appreciate the necessity of law and government after their emancipation from bondage. Their only idea of liberty was a license to do as they pleased. Another difficulty in the way of the Mosaic administration, was the unsettled condition of the people. They were wanderers, without homes and without adequate employment. We cannot conceive of a more difficult position than that occupied by Moses as a Hebrew ruler in the wilderness. If a more potent arm than his own had not upheld him, he would have been overwhelmed by his rebellious subjects, and there would have

been no Pisgah for him at the end of his life-journey. He was altogether a most remarkable and interesting character. He stands alone in the quality and magnitude of his work. He had no predecessor and has had no successor. History has no record of but one Moses.

In looking at the civil order established by Moses, we must, as far as possible, separate it from the strictly religious rules ordained for the worship of God in the tabernacle. Although he was the head of a combined religious and civil administration, we shall recollect that his rules for civil order were for men and not saints. Not many Hebrews in the time of the great law-giver came up to the character of a saint. If there was one entitled to be so called, I do not now recall his name. God did not work a miracle on each Hebrew, and make him an intelligent, moral, and orderly citizen. He conferred on this people exalted privileges, but they abused them all, and made it necessary for the same human agencies to be employed in their government that were requisite for a race of pagans.

The circumstances under which the law was delivered to Moses were tremendously impressive, and were doubtless intended to awe the people into unquestioning obedience, but the spirit of those laws had been anticipated by Confucius, and the Pharaohs, and the Greek, and the Roman, and the Aztec, ages before; and herein we find a common source and a common authority for all laws which comprehend the fundamental rules of right and justice. God is the source of all that is good.

And although the pagan races which had established beneficent forms of government and enacted wholesome laws, could not trace the origin of those laws to tables of stone, written thereon by the finger of God, yet they could and did trace them to a legible handwriting on human hearts, written thereon by the common Author of all human existence. The frequent manifestations of the divine hand in the government of Israel was occasioned by the wicked and restless character of the people. They had to be kept under the rod continually in order to be held even nominally in the line of their duty. And for the purposes of this

argument, we repeat again, that no divine power was ever invoked to aid in the administration of the purely civil department of the Hebrew government. It did not require a miracle or any divine interposition to enable a Hebrew judge to decide a matter of controversy between two of his neighbors; but for his loyalty to the divine Master, he was held to a strict account by that Master himself, and considering the great number of flagrant violations of this duty, the wonder is that God did not obliterate him from the face of the earth; and but for his promises (which never fail) to Abraham and to Jacob, he doubtless would have done so.

In passing, I may be allowed to express the opinion that the rejection of Christ by the Jews is but in keeping with their history and character. Their own inherent perverseness and obduracy would prompt them to this act, without reference to any other considerations. What a natural and consistent product from Jewish character is the Pharisee, as described in the New Testament!

From this summary of the character and condition of the people whom Moses was called to govern, we will be able to determine the adaptability of his laws to that end. His code has been called harsh and bloody, but will the reader recall for a single moment the character of the people over whom these laws were to be enforced? Would any other form of law and administration have sufficed for the purpose? As it was, no ruler in all history had so difficult a task before him as did Moses. With occasional visitations of the divine vengeance, exhibited under circumstances of terrible solemnity, the people soon forgot the hand that punished them as well as the hand that blessed them. We conclude, then, that the Mosaic code was wisely adapted to its purpose and end. Under it, he held the people together for forty years in a homeless wilderness, and finally left them in sight of the promised land.

It is claimed as a matter of great moment that Moses was the first ruler in the world who permitted the people to have any voice and authority in the selection of subordinate magistrates. This right, however, did not belong to the Mosaic constitution as it existed in Grecian and Roman republics.

It was simply a permission granted to the people by Moses, because the burden of administering the law in all its details for perhaps three million people was too great for any one man to bear. He says: "And I spake unto you at that time, saying, I am not able to bear you myself alone. How can I myself alone bear your cumbrance, and your burden, and your strife? Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you;" and he adds, "I charged you judges at the time, saying, Hear the causes between your brethren, and judge righteously. . . . Ye shall hear the small as well as the great; ye shall not be afraid of the face of man; . . . and the cause that is too hard for you, bring it unto me." Here is something of an independent judiciary solemnly charged as to their duty and the right of appeal allowed to the great judge of all the people. It is a little singular that the first suggestion of a division of his authority and labor should come from a gentile—Jethro the Midianite, father-in-law of Moses. But in this subdivision of authority, the subordinate magistrate was invested with judicial and executive authority also. The absolutely and purely judicial office was reserved for the wisdom of the American Aztec in ancient times. But the Hebrew judiciary was similar to both the Greek and Roman. The Senate of Seventy was a high court of appeals, and is analogous to similar institutions in anterior and contemporaneous governments, and has been perpetuated to our times. The General Assembly of the people, called in the Bible the congregation, was the source of political power in the Hebrew Commonwealth. Whether this term congregation meant an assembly of the whole people, or only representatives of the different tribes, is not necessary now to discuss. My own view is, it means the latter. On extraordinary occasions, perhaps, the whole people might assemble and prefer their requests to Moses, as when they asked him to send spies into the promised land. This is not important, however, and we only add that the Hebrew economy was not a democracy; it was rather an autocracy, with certain important privileges voluntarily granted to the people by

their ruler on his own motion, and which could not be demanded or claimed as a legal right.

Another rather anomalous condition of Hebrew society was the complete isolation of the race from other communities of people, and the prohibition against amalgamation with the gentile world. This custom became an inflexible law to the Jew, and prevails to this day. "They did not conquer for empire, but for use." This was God's economy, however, and not the idea of Moses. There was a divine purpose in it. Except when taken captive, the Jew, once settled in Palestine, remained true to his country, and hence did not become scattered over the earth in search of wealth and enterprise before the dispersion, and as a consequence, there is not a trace of commercial law in the Mosaic code.

To be merciful to a debtor and still secure the rights of the creditor has been a problem to law-making authorities for ages. Under the Hebrew system, the debtor fared much better than under the Roman. In the latter, the debtor was at one time liable to be cut in as many pieces as he had merciless creditors. Of course this was in the more barbarous periods of the civil law. But the Hebrew debtor could look forward to release every seven years, and herein is analogy to the insolvent laws of modern times; and the year of jubilee was equivalent to a discharge by a bankrupt court. There was nothing similar to these provisions in any ancient system of law of which I have any knowledge. The practice of usury was expressly forbidden, as it is now in all modern societies. The law of England at one time went even further, and held that any interest at all for the use of money was usury, and this may be the sense in which the term usury is used in the Mosaic law. This was not the later signification of the term. But the Jew now is the great money-lender of the world. The family relation was guarded with special jealousy. The duty of the children to honor their parents is repeated over and over again, and in this particular it is superior to all ancient systems of law. The Roman law gave the father almost absolute power over his children and his wife. The common law very justly

claims superiority over the civil law in that particular. Indeed, this feature of the Mosaic code has more of a divine aspect than any other in the whole system. The duty enjoined in the treatment of strangers stands alone in the history of all countries and all law.

The injunction to observe the Sabbath day is strictly and peculiarly a religious institution. Most modern governments have ordained the Sabbath as a day of rest, from considerations of public policy, rather than as a Christian duty. The law of marriage as laid down by Moses, is founded in natural and physical reasons, which were not generally apprehended by the older governments; but his rules regulating marriage within certain degrees of consanguinity have been adopted by nearly all Christian nations. The law of inheritance was not essentially different from similar laws among other civilized peoples. Small differences as to the line of inheritance in case the ancestor died without descendants are observable in different codes, but the rule obtains everywhere that a man's children are the first to claim his property at his death. There was special provision that land should not descend to any one not of the tribe of the deceased.

This special reference to some of the Mosaic rules must suffice. It will be seen at a glance that Moses has no where set out in detail the whole body of the law which the judges administered from the bench.

The great body of the law as administered by the courts, is found in that unwritten code which found expression in the judgments and decrees of the judges when occasion called them forth. This was then true, and is now true, of the law in all countries. No government in the world has attempted to embody in any written code all the principles of law which the courts are authorized to enunciate in a cause in which no precedent law is found. This statement finds corroboration in my own experience on the bench. A question was raised upon which no authority could be found in any English or American report. A copy of every printed report in the English language was in the great library to which the court and attorneys had access, and

after a whole day's examination by seven of the ablest lawyers in the State, no decided case could be found that bore even a remote analogy to the one before the court. That point had to be decided according to the principles of justice as understood by the judge, and was so decided. In a short time after that the identical point was raised in the courts of another State, and was decided without the authority of precedent, and in the same way that the writer decided it. And by such means it has happened that the general and fundamental rules of law have such a marked similarity as developed in the jurisprudence of all civilized countries. I state another fact in corroboration of this idea. When the writer undertook to teach law in Texas, it became necessary to incorporate in the course of study a book on the civil law of Spain and Mexico. The study of this work was one of great interest to me. Some law-writers insist that the civil law of Rome was the foundation of the Spanish code, but the Spanish authors deny this vehemently. They insist that their code is of purely Spanish origin; but without stopping to try to settle this question, it will suffice to state that the Spanish code bore a remarkable resemblance not only to the civil, but to the common law also. This resemblance was so striking that it was observed and remarked upon by my students very soon after they entered upon its study. I refer of course to the general rules which defined the private rights of the people, and not their relation to the state. This is all very easily understood when we reflect that the principles of justice between man and man are the same in Spain as in Palestine, Rome, and England. There is but one God over all the nations and peoples of the world.

It would follow, then, that when Moses or any of his judges came to pass upon any given question for which there was no authority or precedent, he had simply to refer to his own consciousness, to his own innate sense of right, or to a plainly expressed public opinion, for a rule of decision. The very few written rules promulgated by the law-givers were merely to supplement the more extensive unwritten code, and were also designed to supply rules for the disposition of cases which would arise out of the artificial structure of

society, and which were not referable to any fundamental rule of right. There are a great many questions of this kind arising in all organized communities—cases under the very frame-work of society, and to which the doctrine of natural justice could not be applied. To adjudicate and settle questions of this kind, resort must be had to positive enactments by a law-making power, which provides the machinery for working the law.

We now take up for a brief review the Mosaic criminal code, and we shall avail ourselves of the views of a recent writer on the "Hebrew Commonwealth." His statement is so brief that it may require a little further elucidation. "The criminal code was severe, though not barbarous. The evident aim of the law-giver was to maintain the sanctity of religion and the family relation and civic order among the people. We have been accustomed to think the Mosaic statutes as Draconic, because exemplary penalties were provided for certain offenses now regarded with leniency by men of the world, and the punishment of which is left to private vengeance. But in fact, the laws of Moses, taken as a whole, were less inhuman and rigorous than those in force in England within a century past. Deliberate and premeditated murder, man stealing, the striking or cursing a parent, manslaughter caused by manifold negligence, such as permitting a dangerous animal to go at large (knowing he was dangerous), idolatry, witchcraft, blasphemy, adultery, crimes against nature, were all capital. For injuries not mortal, the principal laid down was an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, a hand for a hand, a foot for a foot, cursing for cursing, wound for wound, strife for strife." Thus is presented the criminal code by Mr. Henry Mann, in his "Ancient and Mediæval Republics," p. 8 and on. At this day, and for a Christian people, this would indeed be considered a bloody code, but for the Hebrew, in his day, it was absolutely necessary. There were then no prisons or penitentiaries or houses of correction. Summary and condign punishment was the policy in all countries in that age. For all grave offenses, the death penalty was common to the laws of all countries; and the idea of *lex talionis* is also the suggestion

of the common mind in all ages. After awhile the more humane practice of paying damages to the injured party was substituted in the place of the "eye for an eye," although the state would still punish the criminal offense. Even in the criminal codes of civilized peoples, we find a remarkable similarity. If a man takes the life of another without just cause, the natural suggestion is that death is the proper penalty. And so in relation to all forms of crime, the idea is universal that the offender should be adequately punished, although men will often differ as to the kind and degree of such punishment. Absolute agreement upon a question purely arbitrary would be impossible.

The severity of the punishment inflicted by Moses brings us back to the idea already advanced, that he was governing a community of human beings, through the instrumentality of human judges, and that the whole machinery of his system was human altogether. It will not do for the theologian to exalt the Hebrew upon a higher plane than the neighboring gentile nations, and claim for him a mild, beneficent, God-given, and God-administered form of government. Thousands of the Hebrews were themselves heathens and idolaters, and nothing but the rule of a heavy hand, often supplemented by divine chastisement, would suffice for their management. They were only men, and were dealt with as such, and that by human rulers. The government of the Hebrew was not a daily, repeated miracle. It was as human as human could be. We have seen that the promulgation of the decalogue was attended with terrible impressiveness, but we have also seen that the spirit of the laws of the two tables had been anticipated by many gentile nations centuries before that time; nor do we insist that the Mosaic jurisprudence is for that reason not of divine origin, but rather that all the good laws of all civilized races of men are derived from the same source; and herein we deduce the fact of the original unity and divine origin of the human race. This remarkable correspondence in the development of the jurisprudence of many nations, widely separated as to time and territory, is not accidental; it is not without an adequate and all-controlling cause; and that cause can

be found only in the infinite wisdom and power which created the world and all the people that are in it.

The unity of the human race and the divine origin of the same are great truths to be established outside of revelation. The simple forces of human wisdom, without a common sentiment on a given subject produced by a divine impulse, would not be adequate cause for a common ground in morals and law, on which we find standing the Chinaman of Eastern Asia, the Aztec of America, the Greek and Roman of Europe, and the Anglo-Saxon of the British islands, and the Jew of Palestine. There is some mysterious, unseen power which, far back in the ages, set the hearts of men in a common mould, and breathed upon those hearts the divine sentiment which comes to mortal view in the fruits of law and order found among all nations. A spark stricken from the Eternal Rock has been let fall on the consciences of all men, and the divine impulse thus awakened has found development in similar systems of jurisprudence all over the globe; so that when the divine sanction was given to law for the government of the Hebrew, under the burning brow of Sinai, it was but a reëcho of that same voice, on a grander occasion, when the great Creator said, Let us make man in our own image, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; gave unto him a soul born of eternity and to endure to eternity. And the distinct lineaments of that image have been exhibited through all the ages, and on the minds of every people under the sun. God manifests himself to men outside of revelation. Indeed, a written revelation is an incident in God's economy, rather than a part of his original plan for the government of intelligent creatures. Revelation was to teach the great fact of redemption by Jesus Christ. Had there been no Redeemer, there had been no written revelation. Men could not know of Christ intuitively, but they could and did bear testimony, perhaps unconsciously, to the omnipotent power and infinite wisdom which created all hearts and enstamped them with his own image, and imbued them all with the same divine principles. He who built the world and peopled it with immortal spirits, and still "holds the finished fabric in the hollow of his

hand," left a history of that stupendous work written all over every created object. The image spoken of in man's creation was intended to be the impress of Heaven's great seal to the patent of his nobility; and although the blight of sin has blurred over the divine inscription, yet it still remains, and nothing but death and hell can utterly and forever destroy it. God, in man's creation, inspires me with an awe and reverence that a contemplation of all the revolving spheres of heaven fail to produce.

The systems of law and government that have arisen since the Christian era, are but reproductions of pagan systems, with modifications adapting them to the new order of things and certain changes ameliorating the penalties of criminal codes. The law of nations, maritime and commercial law, and the law of corporations, are comparatively modern institutions; but even these great and important branches of modern law comprehend only a new application of the ancient fundamental principles of right and justice. On this point we quote from the author of "Ancient Republics" as follows: "In the study of ancient institutions and customs, we learn how little there is new under the sun, how few experiments in civil government have been untried, how few tricks and expedients for the achievement of political objects are original with modern partisans." This bold proposition need not startle the reader. When he reflects that all sound law and beneficent rules of government, whether in pagan or Christian lands, have one and the same origin, he will see the justification of the proposition. We will not be understood, of course, as disparaging the influence of Christianity on human society anywhere. We do not do this.

This line of discussion is only designed to bring out the great fact that God is the universal law-giver and not Moses. This ruler of the turbulent race of Abraham was only one of many to whom the sentiment of right and justice was communicated for purposes of good to the people of his charge, the only difference being that, to Moses God spoke in thunder, in order to strike with awe the hearts of a rebellious race, while to others, he spoke in the still small

voice which awakened the conscience and stimulated the mind to the performance of grand achievements.

We state the proposition that in Christian countries many of the rules laid down by Moses have been entirely abandoned and others have been greatly modified, but this does not prove that the Mosaic economy was not of divine origin; it only proves that Moses adapted his laws to the condition of the people he had to govern, and that modern governments have done the same thing. The *lex talionis* of Moses has been stricken from the code of all Christian nations, yet in his day and for his people, it was a wise and even a necessary measure. We attach no more sanctity and value to the Mosaic code than its merits deserve, and the same degree of commendation may be extended to many other systems, both contemporaneous with and anterior to the time of the Hebrew Commonwealth. Wise laws are not iron rules. The application of them should be through machinery of great flexibility, so as to reach every condition of the multifarious affairs of mankind.

The All-wise Ruler of the world cannot make mistakes, so that when he selected Moses to execute the task of delivering the children of Israel from the power of Pharaoh, he chose one eminently fit for this duty. His character is remarkably symmetrical, strong, and solid. "His head was always level." The balance-wheels of his brain were adjusted to a nicety. He was meek and patient, and he had need for those virtues more than any other ruler of his own or any other times. If it had not been that there was a divine hand leading and assisting him, he would have abdicated his power long before the expiration of the forty years. Yet he was but a man, and he committed sin in the sight of God and was forbidden the great boon of setting his foot on the enchanted soil of the promised land. Judging as men judge, we have often thought that was a hard fate for the grand old hero; but God is always right. There were abundant compensations for Moses, however, in the last days of his life, notwithstanding he had to surrender his scepter to Joshua for a triumphal entry into the promised land. He saw the end of the long journey of his people; he had for

himself one long, enrapturing "look into the land which "flowed with milk and honey," from the summit of Mount Pisgah, and thus consecrated for all time the symbolical significance of the sacred spot—God honored him with ceremonials of burial that had never been vouchsafed to one of the human race. The irreverent iconoclast cannot mutilate that grave to gratify the idle curiosity of men. The secret of the last resting place of God's honored servant is in his breast alone; for God buried him and no one knows to this day the place; and although the drifting sands of the desert may gather over it from century to century, yet the sacred spot will never be forgotten, and the dust of the great hero of all history will quicken and revivify under the blast of the last trumpet, and the leader and law-giver of Israel will merge forever in the glorified spirit of the heavenly land.

R. C. EWING.

ART. II.—BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

BEFORE we proceed to the consideration of other texts of the third class, in which antitype baptism is spoken of without any mention of type baptism, we beg the attention of the reader to some preliminary statements concerning the very familiar figure called *metonymy*, as used in the New Testament. This is not a simile or comparison, nor a metaphor which is an abbreviated simile, but consists in the use of one name for another; as the cause for the effect, or the effect for the cause, the container for the thing contained, and conversely; the sign for the thing signified, and conversely; the type for the antitype, etc. The use of this figure is very common in the Scriptures. Inattention to it is often the occasion of great error. The reader's indulgence is therefore asked while we note a few examples.

(a) "This is the love of God that we keep his commandments."—1 John v, 3. Here the effect is put for the cause. This text literally construed, would teach that religion consists only in external acts; that salvation is by works and not by grace.

(b) "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me and I unto the world."—Gal. vi, 14. Here *cross* is put for the mediation or propitiation of Christ. To take the word *literally*, as thousands do, is to make Paul glory in a wooden structure on which the Saviour died, than which nothing can be more absurd.

(c) "And he took bread and gave thanks, and break it and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you. . . . This cup is the New Testament in my blood which is shed for you."—Luke xxii, 19, 20. Here we have the symbol put for the thing symbolized—the bread for the body and the wine for the blood of Christ. This text, taken literally, is relied upon as proof of the doctrine of

transubstantiation, a doctrine which contradicts common sense and shocks all decency.

Scores of other instances might, but need not, be given.

As John put the effect for the cause, Paul the cross for the benefits of Christ's death, and Christ the bread for his body, and the wine for his blood, we might very reasonably expect baptism to be used in a similar manner. As we have already seen, the Scriptures distinctly announce two radically different baptisms—that of water and that of the Spirit—essentially antithetical in administrative agency, one administered by man, the other by Christ; in the objects of their action—one acting upon the body, the other upon the mind; in their effects—one “sanctifying to the purifying of the flesh,” the other purging the conscience from dead works to serve the living God.” But different as they are seen to be, they nevertheless, as numerous texts previously quoted show, are strictly related as type and antitype. Hence, to affirm that the word “baptism” is sometimes used in a metonymical sense—the type put for the antitype—is to affirm what is known to be true in regard to the word *cross*, in Gal. vi, 14, and the words “bread” and “wine,” in relation to the Lord's supper, in Luke xxii, 19, 20.

If this mode of expression was used by Christ in instituting the sacrament of the supper, which represents propitiation or, the legal side of the plan of salvation, why may not the same mode of expression be used in defining the functions of baptism, which represents reconciliation, or the moral and spiritual side of the plan of salvation?

If, in partaking of the sacramental bread and wine, we only eat and drink the symbols of the body and blood of Christ, and not his real body and blood, how contrary to analogy, and how unreasonable in itself is it to believe that the sacramental water can secure to us anything more than symbolical regeneration?

If the bread and wine consecrated to sacramental uses, confessedly do not constitute an atonement or sacrifice for sin, but only typify Christ's sacrifice for sin, what right have we to infer that sacramental water can purge the soul from sin, or do more than symbolize that purgation?

Nothing could authorize such an inference except the most explicit declarations of the word of God. We, hence, are forced to the conclusion that all those texts of Scripture that represent baptism as putting its subjects, not into the name of Christ, but into Christ himself, are to be taken, not in a literal but in a metonymical sense.

But metonymical baptism is nothing more nor less than spirit baptism—the one baptism, of Eph. iv, 5, and the baptism by one Spirit into one body, of 1 Cor. xii, 13. Let us now subject this class of texts to a brief examination.

I. "For ye are the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."—Gal. iii, 26-28.

Let it be remembered that the apostle is urging the doctrine of justification by faith, in opposition to the doctrine of justification by the deeds of the law. He asserts (*a*) that men are children of God by faith (verse 26); (*b*) that men are put *into* Christ by baptism; (*c*) that those in Christ have put on Christ; that this union with Christ abolishes all distinctions and constitutes all one in Christ. Being baptized into Christ and having put on Christ is, according to the apostle's method, the proof of being the children of God. To be in Christ is to be "a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new" (2 Cor. v, 17), to be reconciled unto God (*ib.*, verse 18). To put on Christ is to avow and cherish the spirit of Christ (Rom. xiii, 14).

Seeing that such vital interests depend on this baptism, it behooves us to ascertain, if possible, what baptism is here intended—whether it is water or spirit baptism. Commentators differ in their expositions, but generally agree in saying it is water baptism. Clarke says water, but regards faith as that which puts its subject into Christ, and as that by which the believer puts on Christ; and regards the baptism as a public profession of this faith. This, however, is no exposition of the text, but is at most only a declaration of the author's general theory of faith, baptism, etc. It, in

fact, supplements the text, puts into it more than is contained in its terms, and withal attributes to one agency what Paul explicitly attributes to another. Henry, Scott, and Lock agree substantially with Clarke. Macknight seems to favor the idea that water baptism puts its subjects into saving union with Christ.

It is with much reluctance that we dissent from the opinions of these men, and many others of equal authority, but fidelity to our convictions requires it, and requires it for the following reasons:

(1) Their explanation pretermits the distinction between *nominal* and real baptism—baptism into the *name* and baptism into the *person or state*. It seems to be almost universally assumed that this is a distinction without a difference—that baptism *into the name of Christ* and baptism *into Christ* are expressive of exactly the same thing. This we think is a grave error, the tendency of which is to stimulate an undue reliance upon ritualism. We respectfully beg the reader to note carefully the following facts:

(a) In every instance of baptism *into the name*, water baptism is manifestly intended.

(b) In no instance does baptism, when the text is known to refer to water, put its subject into Christ, or into anything except the name.

(c) In every instance in which baptism puts its subject into anything except the name, as into Christ or his death or his mystical body, the change expressed by baptism is equivalent to regeneration, spiritual renewal, or a saving union with Christ.

(2) No text comprising the form "*have been baptized into Christ*," or its equivalent, can be intelligibly and satisfactorily explained, or so explained as to show every word to be pertinent and expressive when taken literally, on the hypothesis of a literal water baptism. This fact is conclusive evidence that such texts involve figures of some sort. This is, in fact, the test by which is determined what is literal and what is figurative. This is the reason why Dr. Clarke and the other illustrious men named above—and scores of others might be

added—do not interpret such texts exegetically but doctrinally.

(3) All texts asserting baptism into Christ, etc., may be satisfactorily explained by replacing the symbol with what is symbolized; *e. g.*, verse 27: "For as many of you as have been born from above or regenerated into Christ, have received the mind or spirit of Christ." There is no water in the text, and we suppose there was none in the apostle's mind, and certainly none in the regenerating baptism, as there was none in the baptism of the Hebrews *into Moses*. (1 Cor. xii, 2.)

(4) The assumption that water baptism is intended in this class of texts, requires us either to attribute to faith or something else what the apostle attributes to this baptism, or to attribute to water baptism a power denied to it by scores of other texts; *viz.*, the power to regenerate and save the soul. The first of these alternatives is *bad exegesis*; the second is *bad theology* and *bad philosophy*. It is bad exegesis to ascribe to faith, as Dr. Clarke and others do, what Paul ascribes to this baptism, for the terms are not synonyms, and as has been fully shown, two things so radically different as water and spirit cannot sustain the same relation to the same event. It is true that we become the children of God by faith (verse 26), but it is equally true that faith is only the antecedent and condition of regeneration, and not the baptizing or regenerating agent. Hence the believer is "born again," becomes a son of God, but he is not born of faith, nor spiritually born of water baptism, but of God only. (John i, 12, 18; 1 John v, 1.)

To attribute regeneration to water baptism is bad theology, because it conditions salvation upon works. It is equally bad philosophy, because it conditions moral and spiritual changes upon a physical act.

By these facts we are forced to the conclusion that baptism into the name of Christ and baptism into Christ, etc., are intended to express radically different things, and that no man that confounds them can give a consistent explanation of baptism into Christ. Scripture is the best interpreter of Scripture. The context must never be neglected.

Let the reader bear in mind that the apostle is writing to establish the doctrine of salvation by grace ministered by the Holy Spirit and received by faith, in opposition to the doctrine of salvation by the works of the law. The works of the law consisted in external acts of obedience and in ritualistic observances. But if the apostle puts men into Christ by water baptism, then he plainly teaches to be true what he was attempting to prove is not true, namely, that men are saved by works and not by grace through faith. But as the apostle could perpetrate no such suicidal logie, we know that he does not intend to teach that men are put into Christ by water baptism.

In further confirmation of this view, let us notice the immediate context.

Verse 26 identifies the change expressed by baptism in verse 27 with the new birth in John i, 12, 13: "To them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name, which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The same connection between faith and sonship and the regenerating agent is fully recognized in 1 John v, 1: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." Now let it be distinctly noted that in these texts we have the regeneration which makes us the children of God; faith, which is the antecedent and condition, and the regenerating agent, which is God. So in Gal. iii, 26, 27, we have baptism into Christ, which gives the mind or spirit of Christ, the fundamental characteristic of the children of God. The parallel in the three texts is complete, except that in Gal. iii, 26, 27, the baptizing and regenerating agent is not named. But Paul (1 Cor. i, 30) expressly informs us by what agency we are put into Christ: "But of him (God) are ye in Christ Jesus." All this is further confirmed by the statements of Gal. iii, 28. This verse identifies unmistakably the baptism of the preceding verse with the baptism of 1 Cor xii, 13. Paul to the Galatians says: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male

nor female, for ye are all one in Christ Jesus." To the Corinthians he says: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles (literally Greeks), whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit"—made to imbibe and assimilate the same Christly nature. The parallelism between the two texts is remarkable, and the identity of the leading terms and the identicalness of effects of the baptismal agency in putting its subjects into Christ and into one body, and abolishing all distinctions between Jew and Greek, etc., and in unifying all in Christ, demonstrate beyond the possibility of reasonable doubt that Paul, in both texts, intends the same baptism. Who can thoughtfully compare these texts and say that by baptism in Gal. iii, 27, Paul means water baptism, and that by baptism in 1 Cor. xii, 13, he means another baptism as different from the first as is a *divine act* from a *human act*?

The facts, it seems to us, fully authorize the assertion that the apostle in both texts (Gal. iii, 27, and 1 Cor. xii, 13) refers to the same baptism, and that it is not water, but spirit baptism is expressly affirmed in the latter text: "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body."

The theory of baptismal regeneration, so far from finding aid and comfort from Gal. iii, 27, encounters only irreparable disaster.

II. The same baptism, with some variation in the method of its presentation, is found in Col. ii, 10-13: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses."

The simple question with which we are at present concerned is, How is baptism here intended to be understood?

Is it literal water baptism, or is it metonymical or spirit baptism?

The word *buried* more forcibly expresses death than does the word "death" itself; and "*in baptism*" either expresses the burial act, or the agency by which the burial is accomplished. The death, then, expressed or implied, is a death unto sin, and baptism is either the act of burial, or of dying unto sin, or the agency by which this is accomplished. Hence, whether the Colossians were buried *in baptism*, or by baptism, as in Rom. vi, 4, there could be no burial and no death unto sin and no salvation without baptism. Hence, if this baptism is literal water baptism, then baptismal regeneration is true. We, however, deny both the premise and the conclusion. This we do for the following reasons:

1. That baptism does not regenerate and save men has been, we think, fully proven by the numerous facts already presented. The Scriptures are presumed to be in harmony with themselves and do not teach conflicting doctrines. This text is presumed to be in harmony with many others which condemn the doctrine in question, whether that harmony can be distinctly shown or not.

2. Many of the statements made in our discussion of Gal. iii, 26-28, are equally pertinent to this text, as they are also to all the texts of this class. There is not a perfect parallel between Gal. iii, 26-28, and Col. ii, 10-13, yet the points of resemblance are sufficiently numerous and striking to authorize the conclusion that the word "baptism" is used in the same sense in both texts. This being true, if Paul did not mean to teach the Galatians that they were saved by ritual baptism, then he did not mean to teach this doctrine to the Colossians.

3. The general design and scope of this epistle, especially of this part of it, seems hardly consistent with the introduction of ritualism in this particular connection. He asserts the fullness of God as dwelling in Christ. This he does, it is believed, in opposition to a Gnostic heresy that had obtained some currency at Colosse. These Gnostics used the word *pleroma* (fulness) to represent an assemblage of emanations or angelic powers proceeding from God. These

emanations or angels, or principalities and powers, of whom Christ was believed to be one, were objects of worship, and were believed to afford aid and comfort to the initiated, and on this account were called the *pleroma*, or fulness of God to the esoteric circle. In opposition to this angelolatry or angel-worship, Paul asserts that the *pleroma* of the Godhead dwells in Christ, and that he is not coördinate with angels, as powers and principalities, but is the head of all the principalities and powers, and that it is in him that men are complete; or, as Conybeare and Howson read, "in him you have your fulness." The same word occurs in the same connection in John 1, 16. Now this *pleroma*, whether we call it completeness or fulness or sufficiency, of which those in Christ are assured, is nothing more nor less than grace—"grace for grace." (John 1, 16.) These facts exclude the idea that men are put savingly into Christ by any external physical act, such as water baptism.

4. It is a very noteworthy and significant fact that all the leading terms in this passage are used, not in a literal but tropical sense, unless it can be shown that baptism is an exception.

The words *complete* and *head* in verse 10; *circumcision* made without hands, *the putting off*, *body*, and *flesh*, and the *circumcision* of Christ, in verse 11; *buried with him*, *risen with him*, in verse 12; and *dead in your sins*, the *uncircumcision* of your *flesh*, and *quickened together with him*, in verse 13, are taken in a figurative sense. All represent super-physical things and events.

That we have correctly characterized these words, we suppose none will question, except those who are tempted by their theory to find a literal dipping in the word *buried*. It should be observed, however, that if a dipping can, by any means, be evolved from a burial, still the burial must be tropical; because we can never, by any sort of word-torturing, extort a literal dipping out of a literal burial of any kind. But we will not follow this train of thought further, as it pertains rather to the mode than to the design of baptism. It is simply a self-evident proposition that buried in the text cannot be taken in a literal sense; for while the

Colossian believers were *buried*, Paul being judge, all know that they were not literally buried in any way.

The question which especially concerns us at present is, whether this is a literal water baptism, and such a baptism, too, as puts its subjects into a state of death unto sin and makes them alive unto God. We answer that the tropical character of its verbal associates utterly forbids the idea that literal baptism is intended. To assert literality of this baptism, is to assert that a physical act puts a rational soul into a state of death unto sin, buries it in some sense with Christ, and raises it to a new life with him. Such a method of interpretation gives to the whole passage an air half grave and half comic, and withal makes it unintelligible and incredible.

5. The key to the true interpretation of this baptism, if we are not deceived, is given in verse 11: "In whom ye also are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ." [Conybeare and many other critics reject the words, "*of the sins*," as an interpolation, and read, "*whole body of the flesh*."]

Circumcision, like baptism, is sometimes used in a literal and sometimes in a figurative sense. Literal circumcision was of the flesh; a physical act, in the performance of which a part of the literal flesh was put off, or cut and cast off, and was a highly significant symbol of purification, or regeneration, or putting off the body (of course the whole body) of the flesh. This was type circumcision. The true circumcision was of the Spirit, "in which was realized all that is symbolized by physical circumcision. This distinction runs through the Old and the New Testament. See Deut. x, 14; xxx, 6; Jer. iv, 4; ix, 25; Rom. ii, 28, 29. Now, there can be no difficulty in understanding in what sense circumcision is used in the text under consideration. The text is self-luminous. The phrases, *circumcision made without hands*, *putting off the body of the flesh*, and *the circumcision of Christ*, mean the same thing, and are mutually epexegetical. This is called the circumcision of Christ, not because it is the equivalent of Christian baptism, as some literalizers insanely

dream, but because it is ministered by the regenerating Spirit, and puts its subjects into saving union with Christ—makes them dead unto sin and alive unto God. Verse 12 is a continuation of the same sentence and the same line of thought. The symbolism only is changed from circumcision to baptism, the fundamental ideas remaining as nearly the same as the change of figure would permit. In fact, the two verses, 11 and 12, are mutually exegetical, one by the use of Jewish and the other by that of Christian symbols, asserting the doctrine of spiritual purification and union with Christ, "who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption," and in whom "we are sealed unto the day of redemption." (1 Cor. i, 30; Eph. iv, 30.) The apostle thus identifies circumcision and baptism, both in their typical and antitypical character, in their ritualistic and spiritual signficancy. Now, we know with the fullest certainty that circumcision, in verse 11, is used in its spiritual signficancy; and it seems to us the most improbable of all improbable things that the apostle should identify spiritual circumcision with ritual baptism. Hence, to assert literality of this baptism is to assert, by logical consequence, that the Christian dispensation is more formal or less spiritual than the Mosaic.

6. Further evidence of the spiritual character of this baptism is found in the antithesis implied between the *burial* and the *resurrection* presented in the text. This antithesis is fully brought out in the parallel passage in Romans vi, 4. Antitheses and comparisons of a logical character require their antithetical terms to be homogeneous. Paul recognizes this rule (1 Cor. ii, 13) when he says, "Which things also we speak, . . . comparing spiritual thing with spiritual." Now it is clear enough that the resurrection, which forms one member of this antithesis, is not physical resurrection from the dead, but a spiritual resurrection from a state of death in sin. Two facts put this beyond the possibility of doubt: (a) The apostle predicates this resurrection, as an accomplished fact, of the Colossian Christians to whom he wrote. (b) This resurrection is "through the faith of the operation of God." It, therefore,

follows from logical necessity that if the resurrection is spiritual, the burial is also spiritual; and if the burial and resurrection are spiritual, the baptism in which, or by which, they are both accomplished is also spiritual and not physical. It is also worthy of notice that both the burial and resurrection are in immediate association with Christ—*buried with him in baptism; risen with him in baptism.* Was this union with Christ literal and physical or moral and spiritual? The Bible and common sense, it seems to us, require the same answer.

By way of recapitulation, let us restate the facts. Circumcision and baptism have, as divine ordinances, the same ritualistic and spiritual functions. Exactly what one could do in relation to the physical man and in relation to the spiritual man, the other could do, no more, no less.

But the circumcision in verse 11 is without hands—is the circumcision of Christ—and consists in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, and is, therefore, not physical, not ritual, but spiritual circumcision.

The burial and resurrection of verse 12 are, of necessity, homogeneous—both physical or both spiritual. But the resurrection is spiritual, because predicated of living men, and is “through the faith of the operation of God.” Therefore the burial is not physical but spiritual. But both the burial and the resurrection are comprised in the baptism, and make up the sum total of it. It, therefore, is not physical, not ritual, but spiritual.

7. The substance of the whole matter is graphically presented in verse 13: “And you being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses.”

Here we have (a) the unregenerate state, “dead in your sins,” etc.; (b) the quickening together with him. This is one of the functions of spiritual circumcision—purification in Christ; also one function of baptism, “wherein ye are also risen with him.” (c) “Having forgiven you all trespasses.” This is the correlative function of circumcision—“putting off the whole body of the flesh;” also of baptism, “buried with him into death.” (See Eph.

III, 1, 5, 6; John vi, 63.) This verse (13) effectually excludes the idea of all physical and ritualistic agency and instrumentality in the baptism of verse 12, but harmonizes fully and corroboratively with the idea of metonymical or spirit baptism.

III. Rom. vi, 1—4: “What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.” This text is pressed into service by those who advocate the theory of baptism by *dipping* (improperly and vaguely called *immersion*). It is also made to do service in the interest of baptismal regeneration. It is only in the latter aspect of the subject that we propose to discuss it.

A parallelism between verses 3 and 4 and Col. ii, 12, is generally admitted. An important supposed ellipsis has to be filled in each text to make the parallel complete. But after the supposed ellipses have been supplied in the most approved manner, the text still remains a verbal enigma—a veritable puzzle to commentators, exegetes, critics, and system-builders. This arises partly from the figurative use of the ambiguous words that form the basis of the different propositions. But perhaps the trouble arises chiefly from not properly discriminating between what is intended to be taken literally and what figuratively.

We have consulted all the works within our reach that grapple this difficult text, and find that all assume water baptism to be here intended. Those writers, however, that deny baptismal regeneration find themselves under the necessity of supplementing the text, or of putting into their expositions more than a fair exegesis authorizes, in ascribing to one agency or instrumentality what Paul ascribes to another. The advocates of baptismal regeneration, on the other hand, entrenching themselves behind the concessions of their opponents, have no trouble on the score of exegesis,

in holding their position or in proving baptismal regeneration. In all candor, if physical baptism puts its subjects into Christ, ethically and spiritually, and into his sacrificial and vicarious death, and thereby frees them from condemnation, and does all this that they may walk in newness of life: then it seems quite certain that without water there is no salvation. If water baptism is here intended, we confess our inability to put Paul in harmony with the other sacred writers, or even to put Paul *here* in harmony with himself *elsewhere*; and our examination of commentators and critics on this text has fully satisfied us that they have not reconciled Paul to himself. They fail, not for the want of ability, but because they proceed on a false assumption, and labor to construe literally what Paul intended to be taken figuratively.

A chapter of medlies, very amusing and in some respects very instructive, and displaying withal great subtilty and learning, might be collated from the expositions of our best critics, such as Scott, Henry, Clarke, Bloomfield, Macknight, Stuart, Hodge, Conybeare, Lange, and others. For such a collation we, however, have no space in this article, but refer the reader to the expositions themselves.

The principal reasons for our dissent from the current opinion concerning this baptism, and for the advocacy of a contrary hypothesis, are as follows:

1. Because the current theory fails to recognize the clear and well defined distinction between baptism into the *name* of Christ and baptism into Christ himself, assuming, as it does, that the sacred writers make a distinction without a difference. This virtually denies plenary inspiration, or else attributes carelessness to the sacred writers, neither of which is admissible.

2. This text closely affiliates with 1 Cor. x, 2, baptism into Moses; xii, 12, by one Spirit all baptized into one body; Gal. iii, 27, baptized into Christ; Col. ii, 12, buried with him in baptism. These texts form a distinct class, clearly distinguished both by their respective contexts and by their verbal forms from those that speak of baptism into the *name*. The various facts presented in the examination of

these texts, which are for the most part equally pertinent to Rom vi, 3, 4, exclude the idea of water baptism from the latter.

3. The current theory attributes to ritual baptism functions which, as has been seen, it does not and from the nature of the case cannot possess.

(a) This baptism puts its subjects, not into the name, but into Christ. Now, "if any man be in Christ he is a new creature."—? Cor. v, 17. This is simply regeneration.

(b) It puts its subjects into Christ's death. But Christ's death is a vicarious satisfaction to the divine law, and those that are made partakers of this expiatory death are released from condemnation—are "justified by his blood" or death. (Rom. v, 9.)

(c) This baptism also buries its subjects with Christ into death. The current interpretation is that it buries its subjects with Christ into death unto sin, but we protest—in the name of all decency, we protest against definitive burial before death, and especially against a burial in order to produce death. Lange sees the absurdity of this view and seeks to free the interpretation from it. He says: "Buried in death; an oxymoron, according to which burial precedes and death follows, as is illustrated in the immersion into the bath of baptism." Parenthetically, in the immersion into the bath, does the "death follow" the burial? If so, what space of time elapses before the death occurs? Or, do not the facts utterly exclude the possibility of precedence and sequence? In very truth, are not immersion, the burial, and the death not only synchronal, but absolutely identical? and is not the agent or instrument hopelessly confounded with the effects of its own action?

But the oxymoron—what of it? Well, it is just as hard to find the oxymoron in the text as it is to find the immersion. Death and burial are not contradictory terms, but are in themselves quite non-contradictory. Now we beg to suggest that oxymoron is not the criminal, since it is entitled to the benefits of an alibi; nor is Paul greatly at fault, since he expresses himself in a manner that is not necessarily absurd, or even unintel-

ligible. The interpretation, if we mistake not, is the guilty party.

With all becoming deference to the opinions of others, we respectfully suggest that there are two grave errors in the interpretation of verse 4, as given by immersionists; first, in the misapplication of the words "into death;" and, secondly, in the misinterpretation of the word "buried." The first error is common to immersionists and anti-immersionists. The words *into death* in verse 4, we take to have exactly the same application that the words *into his death* have in verse 3, both referring, not to the believer's death unto sin, as is generally understood, but to Christ's vicarious death, as we have noted. If it is objected that this requires us to supplement the text by supplying the pronoun "*his*," we reply, the pronoun "*his*" is supplied in the preceding verse, and as no other death is distinctly named in the immediate connection, we have no right to assume another to be intended. Moreover, if this view requires us to supply the pronoun *his*, the current theory requires us to supply, at least in thought, the pronoun *our*, and also the adjunct *unto sin*. So that in every aspect of the subject, there is less supplementation on the plan we propose than on the other.

If it is further objected that to make the words *unto death*, in verse 4, refer to Christ's death, would be to make Paul's "therefore" a *non sequitur*, it being his design to prove that those that are baptized into Christ are dead unto sin. Such certainly was the apostle's design, and we insist that his object is much more logically and intelligibly secured by the plan we suggest than on the other. But the objector may inquire, Where is the *death unto sin* on this plan? We answer, with the utmost confidence, *In the word BURIED*. The death unto sin is included in the burial with Christ. Let the reader try Paul's logic on this hypothesis. "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are made dead with him (verse 8) by baptism into *his death*." This seems to us to render the text more perspicuous and intelligible than the opposite plan; and withal supercedes the necessity of any oxymorons, and completely avoids the absurdity of a

burial before death and *a burial in order to death*. This view of the subject seems to us to be strongly supported by verse 8: "Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him."

Of course, there will be an abundance of protests against finding this death unto sin, or death with Christ, in the words *buried with him*. It will be objected that death and burial are not synonymous. We do not assume that they are so ordinarily, or even in this case, but we do assert, what every body knows, that burial presupposes death. There can be no *burial* without *death*. They are ordinarily, and in reference to Christ especially, the complements of each other. Schaff, in Lange, says: "To be buried is a stronger expression than to die, for burial confirms death and raises it beyond doubt." Burial being a stronger word than death, and his premises fully authorizing him to put it in his conclusion, Paul does not hesitate to do so. The word "bury" is quite accurately defined *to protect* or make secure the dead, without any regard to the modal acts by which this protection or security is afforded. His conclusion, therefore, is equivalent to this: Therefore we are secured with him in a state of death unto sin by baptism into his death. Much might be said in support of this view of the subject, but our space forbids more at present.

We have seen that this baptism puts its subjects into Christ, not into his name; into his death, not into any symbol or semblance of his death; and into a confirmed state of death unto sin in him. For ye are dead and your life is hid with Christ in God (Col. III, 3): and all this "that like as Christ was raised up from the dead (not the grave) by the glory of the Father, even so we should also (not be raised up from a liquid grave, not from a state of death *into sin*—such a resurrection would be fatal—but) from a state of death *in sin*, to walk in newness of life."

The question may now be pertinently put, Is all this wonderful change in man's moral condition, securing to him reconciliation to God and freedom from condemnation, peace with God and a new life, the result of ritual baptism? The credulity necessary to believe this, it seems to us, need not

hesitate to accept any hypothesis, however extravagant or absurd.

4. As in Col. ii, 10-13, so in Rom. vi, 3-6, the apostle presents baptism in such connection with other things as to preclude the idea of water baptism.

In the latter text he uses three terms as substantially representative of the same thing, yet each presenting some new aspect of the subject. The terms are *buried* (verse 4), *planted* (verse 5), and *crucified* (verse 6). That these terms all refer to the same radical change in man's condition, will not be questioned; and as they depend on baptism, as cause or condition, a correct apprehension of their import cannot fail to shed valuable light on the character of that baptism. The first, *buried*, having already been briefly considered, the word *planted* will next receive brief attention. By the way, it may be truthfully said that it requires more time and labor to free this word from its *abuse* than to indicate its proper *use*.

(a) *Its abuse.* By a certain class of expositors it is taken to indicate baptism by *thorough dipping*. We are not now particularly concerned with the mode of baptism, but as the word has an important bearing on the capacity of ritual baptism, it merits some attention.

We have often been both amused and amazed at what seems to us the exorbitant demands of the dipping theory, improperly called immersion; also at the marvelous facility with which it finds the means of gratifying its demands. It readily finds a *dipping* in *baptism*; with equal facility finds it in *burying*; and marvels that everybody does not find it in *plunging*. Fancies are often mistaken for facts—illusions for realities. Macknight, in noticing this word, says: "The burying of Christ and believers in baptism is fitly enough compared to the planting of seeds in the earth." In reference to this statement, Prof. Taylor exclaims, "How ignorant are some learned men!" and then says, "Seeds are not planted; they are sown." Human bodies, definitively buried by interment, or by any other mode, are never said to be *planted* but *sown*. The word expressive of this fact is *σπειρω* (See 1 Cor. xv, 42-44.) On the contrary, our word *to plant*

(*ψυτεύω*), is never used in the sense of *to sow*, or to signify complete covering or envelopment in the earth, or in anything else. The word is literally used to denote transplanting or engrafting, as the planting of trees, vines, etc. In James 1, 21, the word is translated *engrafted*; and this, without reasonable doubt, is the proper meaning of the word in Romans vi, 5. The meaning of the words, "If we have been planted together," is, without reasonable doubt, If we have been *transplanted* or *engrafted* with him or into him. This planting, Paul being judge, is equivalent to the *burying* in the preceding verse; and this *burying* again, as has been seen, is equivalent to a confirmed death unto sin, and the new life indicated in the last part of the verse. Now let it be distinctly noted that we have here the same two elements, viz., *death unto sin* and *life unto God*. The vine when transplanted becomes dead in reference to the soil of the old location; no longer draws its nutriment, its life from it, but becomes alive in reference to the new location—receives its food and its life from it.

Engrafting more aptly expresses the death unto sin and life unto God. The scion, cut from its parent trunk, no longer lives by virtue of its old relation—is dead to its former condition. Engrafted into a new stock, it draws its sap from it, and thus receives a new life. It is dead unto the old, but is alive unto the new. The life of the stock is the life of the scion engrafted with it. The life of the former is dependent on the latter, but the life of the latter is simply a participation of that of the former.

But this planting is "in the likeness of his (Christ's) death." Yes, "in the likeness of his *death*"—not of a *burial* of any kind. The similitude is not between the position of Christ's body while in Joseph's new tomb and the body of the neophyte while under "the crystal wave," but between his dying unto sin (verse 10) and the death unto sin of those engrafted with him. Though he knew no sin, yet he was made sin for us and paid its penalties by his death, and by his death passed from its dominion into a state of freedom. In like manner, those that are engrafted with him pass from the dominion of sin into a state of death unto sin, and are

freed from condemnation (verse 7). Such are also mystically united with him in his resurrection. On Friday morning, before he expired on the cross, Christ's body was mortal, needing food and raiment, and subject to all the pains and natural evils common to human bodies; but on Sunday morning, by the resurrection, his body is planted—transplanted, engrafted—into a new condition; has passed from a mortal to an immortal state; hungers no more, thirsts no more for such food or drink as earth can give; nor longer suffers the ills to which mortal flesh is heir. He belongs no longer to earth but to heaven, into which state he is transplanted, where he lives to die no more. For the likeness of this resurrection is the spiritual resurrection or quickening of the human soul, when quickened and raised from a state of death in sin to a state of life unto God.

The similarity does not consist in the similarity of bodily uprising movements in the body of Christ when coming from the side entrance of Joseph's rock-excavated tomb, and the movement of the body when lifted from a horizontal to a perpendicular, as in dipping. The likeness consists rather in the revitalizing, the quickening of the dead body of Jesus into an immortal life, and in the quickening of the spiritually dead soul into a new life—a life of communion and fellowship with Christ, whence it draws its life, as the engrafted branch draws its vitality from its new stock. Both these resurrections, be it remembered, are by the power of God.

5. The third term used by the apostle to express this change wrought upon the human mind, is the word *crucified*: "Knowing this that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that we should not serve sin."—Verse 6. This crucifixion of the old man (natural depravity with its developed tendencies) for the destruction of the body of sin (the carnal nature), in order to free the soul from the service of sin, completes the apostle's triplex climax. Each succeeding figure increases in vigor and clearness, and the whole representation of the divine work upon the human soul in saving it from sin and death, and in fitting it for God's service on earth and

for purification in the bliss of heaven, culminates in crucifixion with Christ.

Now, be it remembered that all this process—this burial with Christ, this engrafting together, this crucifixion with him that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin—is accomplished by baptism, either as cause or condition.

The question is again pertinent, Is this water baptism or spirit baptism?

We have now noticed, in connection with these contexts, all the passages in which occurs the form baptism *unto Christ*, etc., in distinction from the form baptism *into the name*, etc. And certainly this is not a distinction without a difference. It is not *accidental*, but *intentional*, and always indicates a *difference* in the baptizing agency. Baptism into the name is always nominal, ritual, water baptism. Baptism into Christ is the antitype of water baptism, and is expressive of divine agency; is the *one* baptism—baptism into *one body* by the Spirit; and hence all the texts in which this form occurs are irreconcilable with the theory of baptismal regeneration.

IV. There is another class of texts that have a bearing on the subject in hand, and therefore merit some attention.

1. "That he might sanctify and cleanse it (the Church) with the washing of water by the word."—Eph. v, 26.

"With the washing of water" is generally allowed to refer to baptism, but in the text we have both *sanctify* and *purify*, and the latter is by baptism. The value of this purification is clearly enough ascertained by comparing this text with John ii, 6; iii, 25, 26. These texts identify, as has been shown, baptism and purification. But John's baptism, while it purified, could not save (Matt. iii, 7, 8). It then, of necessity, purified only in a ritualistic sense. The word "sanctify" is the same used by Christ (John xvii, 17): "Sanetify them through thy truth; thy word is truth. This sanctification is of the Spirit (1 Peter i, 2), and through or by the word—the sword of the Spirit. This washing, then, can mean nothing more than symbol baptism.

2. "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience

and our bodies washed with pure water."—Heb. x, 22. The heart is sprinkled from an evil conscience. Of course this is by "the blood of sprinkling"—the blood of Christ, which "purges the conscience from dead works to serve the living God."—Heb. ix, 14. The washing with pure water is restricted to the body, and of necessity does no more than sanctify to the purifying of the flesh (Heb. ix, 14). Here the respective functions of ritual baptism and spirit baptism are sharply discriminated and defined.

3. "But after the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward men appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour."—Titus iii, 4-6.

Here water baptism and spirit baptism are both put in connection with salvation; but, as has been previously shown, they cannot both sustain the same relation to it, and are related to each other only as type and antitype. The washing is not the regeneration, but only the symbol of it.

This class of texts, we feel safe in asserting, affords no countenance to "the gospel in the water."

V. Before closing our reference to texts strictly preceptive, we deem it pertinent to notice 1 Cor. i, 14-17: "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel."

Note.—(a) Paul thanked God that he had baptized but few of the Corinthians. This thanksgiving is utterly inconsistent with the hypothesis that salvation is secured by baptism, or that ritual baptism is in any sense essential to salvation.

(b) Paul was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel. The apostle here discriminates between baptism and the gospel. Now, the gospel certainly includes everything essential to salvation, but, Paul being judge, it does not

include ritual baptism. Therefore baptism is not essential to salvation.

Note.—1 Peter iii, 21. This text is obscure and very difficult of a strictly literal exposition. The baptism there spoken of, however, is evidently not literal water baptism, whose office is to cleanse from the filth of the flesh and not to purge the conscience.

The facts already presented, it would seem, ought to be sufficient to settle forever the question of the design and value of water baptism. But as old convictions and strong prepossessions from force of education, etc., are often hard to remove, we will supplement the facts already given by an appeal to some instances of conversion or regeneration before baptism.

1. The three thousand on Pentecost. (Acts ii, 36-40.)

If they were not really pious and regenerate Jews prior to that day, it is quite clear that they were brought into a saved state on that day and prior to their baptism.

(a) They heard Peter's sermon and believed the truth as he presented it, otherwise they would not, could not, have been pricked in their hearts and filled with a sense of remorse sufficient to overcome their former *indifference*, probably *prejudice*, against Christ and his apostles.

(b) They sought in an humble and penitent manner, instruction as to their duty, having learned that "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved."

(c) The Holy Spirit, whose office it is to reprove the world of sin, and to take of the things that are Christ's and show them unto us, was present in his converting as well as in his miraculous power.

(d) Being Jews, they knew the exact relation between repentance and baptism, for John had set the whole matter in a clear light before their minds, refusing to baptize without evidence of repentance, or that the hearts of those coming to his baptism had been previously purified by righteousness. (Matt. iii, 7, 8; Josephus, Jew. Ant., b. xviii, ch. 5, sec. 2.)

(e) They gladly, with joyful readiness—such joy as the Holy Spirit inspires (Gal. v, 22)—received, believed the word,

the gospel in all its fullness and freeness. That they repented and believed before they were baptized, none dare deny. But John says, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God"—not *shall be*, but *is* born of God. The facts may be summed up in a nutshell-argument, and presented so clearly that none but the self-determined skeptic can doubt.

Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God.

The three thousand Jews believed that Jesus is the Christ before they were baptized; therefore they were born of God before they were baptized.

Again: Peter (Acts xv, 8, 9) says, God "put no difference between us (Jews) and them (Gentiles), purifying their hearts by faith."

God purified the hearts of Jews and Gentiles by faith, but they had faith before they were baptized; therefore their hearts were purified before baptism, and of course without it.

It seems to us not in the power of human learning or human logic to break these links.

2. Take the case of Cornelius. (Acts x, 2, 4, 22, 30, 31, 34, 35, 43, 44; xi, 14–16; xv, 8, 9.)

This Gentile was a devout man; feared, reverenced, and loved God; gave much alms, prayed always. His prayers and alms had gone up as a memorial before God, and was accepted of God.

Few men have ever given or can give stronger evidence of a regenerate state than did Cornelius, even before he saw Peter, and before the Holy Ghost fell on him in a miraculous way.

This extraordinary or miraculous influence of the Spirit is not conversion, nor causative of it, nor necessarily coincident with it, nor a sure evidence of it. The fact, therefore, that the Holy Spirit did not fall on Cornelius till after his interview with Peter, affords not the slightest presumption that he was not previously in a saved state. But even if it could be made absolutely sure that Cornelius was not saved till the Holy Ghost fell on him, still it is a fact that this event did occur before he was baptized with water.

This fact utterly crushes the baptismal theory of salvation. He was saved *without* baptism, and therefore not *by* it.

But Mr. Campbell and his disciples lay immense stress upon the words of the angel (Acts xi, 13, 14): "Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved?" This, however, brings no aid and comfort to the theory; because Peter, in delivering his message, his words whereby Cornelius might, in some sense, be saved, said not one word about water baptism. The only allusion he makes to remission of sins is in these words (Acts x, 43): "To him (Christ) gave all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Faith and remission are linked as condition and event, but water is not named. Indeed, water baptism was of so little consequence that Peter, who had the keys, (?) never thought of it at all, until he saw that Cornelius was baptized with the Holy Ghost. As the type and antitype mutually suggest each other, the spirit baptism called to Peter's mind water baptism: "Then (Acts xi, 16) remembered I the word of the Lord how he said (Acts i, 5), John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

But what of the words whereby Cornelius should be saved? These words, taken apart from the facts, would raise the presumption that Cornelius was not, at the time of their utterance, in a saved state; but when considered in the light of all the facts, create no such presumption; but, on the contrary, admit of an easy explanation in full harmony with the fact that he was in a saved state before he sent for Peter.

Words are the symbols of truth, and truth is the sword of the Spirit.

God saves, sanctifies through or by the truth. (John xvii, 17.) Cornelius, a resident of Cesarea, and in daily contact with the Jews and Christians, had learned much of this truth—enough to enable him to so worship God as to be accepted of him (x, 34); but being a Roman, was not deemed eligible to membership in the Church, until Peter's vision revealed the fact that the gospel was intended for the Gentile no less than for the Jew. Being a truly regenerate man,

and already better than millions of Christians of the present day, he is now by the agency of Peter and his words, *formally* inducted into the visible Church, and formally, symbolically put into possession of what he already had, and admitted to all the lights, rights, and benefits of the Christian fraternity. This is substantially all that can be got out of the text bearing on the subject in hand.

This case is full of light, giving the divinely instituted order for induction into the Church in the case of adults—first conversion and then baptism, not in order to remission, but outwardly declarative of it, and of a purpose of consecration to God.

3. Saul of Tarsus was converted before his baptism. (Acts ix, 1-18; xxii, 16.)

- (a) He was deeply convicted of his sins.
- (b) He prayed and fasted for three days.
- (c) He showed thorough penitence and contrition on account of sin.
- (d) Was fully resigned to the divine will: "Lord what wilt thou have me to do?"
- (e) He did promptly and exactly what he was commanded.
- (f) His obedience was of faith.
- (g) He was a chosen vessel to bear the gospel to the Gentiles, and this fact was declared to him prior to his baptism.

These certainly are not the characteristics of an unregenerate heart.

But he was commanded to arise and be baptized and *wash away his sins*, calling on the name of the Lord. It is, therefore, insisted that his sins were still unpardonable, and that his baptism was necessary in order to remission.

If we interpret this case in the light of the two preceding, then the conclusion is already reached that the washing away of his sins is to be taken in a formal or ritualistic sense; but if every case must be tried upon its own merits, as they may be gathered from the records, then it is sufficient to state that he had an earnest and submissive and confiding heart. His first prayer, "Who art thou, Lord?" recognizes the hand of God in the matter and evinces full faith in him. When the answer was returned, "I am Jesus, whom thou

persecutest," the whole truth flashed upon him, and he, in the most practical way possible, expresses his full faith in Christ, whom he now recognizes and calls Lord: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" He believed in Jesus, and, therefore, instantly received remission of sin (Acts x, 43). He believed that Jesus is the Christ, and, therefore, was born of God (1 John v, 1). He believed, and, therefore, was not condemned (John iii, 18). He believed, and, therefore, had everlasting life (John iii, 36). More is useless.

These plain truths are in hopeless conflict with theory.

But Mr. Campbell will have us know that baptism is an act of faith, and that faith can realize its appropriate or saving power in baptism.

True, baptism may be an act or outward expression of faith, just as Saul's prayers and obedience were acts or expressions of his faith; but it is not true that faith is dependent upon baptism or any other physical act, either for its existence or its ethical power over the inner or outer man. No safety for the theory in this refuge.

The only possible method of explaining the words, "wash away thy sins," so as not to contradict the plainest teachings of the Bible, is to take them in a metonymical or symbolical sense, as we explain Heb. x, 22: "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed (ritually purified) with pure water."

4. Lydia was saved before baptism. (Acts xvi, 14, 15.) This case is generally referred to by certain water regenerationists as an exemplification of their theory, but we see nothing in it favoring that doctrine.

(a) She seems to have been a woman of prayer, accustomed to resort to the place where prayer was wont to be made (verse 13).

(b) She worshiped God—seems to have been an habitual worshiper before she heard the apostle preach.

(c) "Whose heart the Lord opened." That is a very significant fact. When Jesus opened the *understanding* of the disciples that they might be able to understand the Scriptures, they did understand them in an effective way (Luke xxiv, 45); and when the same Jesus opened the *heart*

of Lydia, not that she *might*, but that she *did*, attend to the truths spoken by Paul. There is no ground for a reasonable doubt that she was freed from condemnation before baptism. From good fruit we infer a good tree, and, judged by this rule, we have no right to say her heart was changed in or by baptism. Judged by other cases, we are safe in saying she was not saved by baptism.

5. The jailer at Philippi was saved before baptism. (Acts XVI, 25-33.) This case is also claimed as supporting the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. We see, however, nothing to prove it or create even a presumption in its favor. The facts are strong against the theory. The jailer was a Gentile and knew little, if anything, about Christianity, but when convinced by a miracle of its truth, and that Paul and Silas were its divinely commissioned expounders, he inquired with pointed earnestness, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" The answer is correspondingly brief and pointed: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." Not a word more of instruction is asked or given on that point. If anything more was necessary in order to his salvation, it was supplied by the Divine Spirit, which shook first the foundations of the prison and then the jailer's heart. If baptism had been an indispensable adjunct of faith, and absolutely necessary in order to salvation, as the theory alleges, it is well nigh, if not quite, certain, that Paul would have said so with as much pith and point as he used in reference to faith. Paul, by what he *did say*, shows the imperative necessity of faith. By what he *did not say*, he shows the non-necessity of baptism.

The jailer having been saved by faith, and, of course, relieved from his guilty fears, forgets himself, and from the unfeeling persecutor, becomes a generous, ministering angel, and washes the blood-reeking bodies and limbs of the very men that he had thrust into the inner prison, and whose feet he had made fast in the stocks. Did baptism convert that leopard into the lamb? No, he has not yet been baptized at all. He really seems more concerned about the apostles' comfort (washing their stripes) than about his own salvation, if the theory is true. Paul was no water-enthusiast—

was not sent to *baptize*, but to *preach* the gospel, and thanked God that he had baptized only two at Corinth. The facts seem to *almost* warrant the assertion that Paul, like Peter in Cornelius' case, had never thought of baptism until he is reminded of it by seeing the water with which the jailer was washing his stripes.

At any rate, it must be accounted the mystery of all psychological mysteries, that the process of soul-saving should be suspended before completed to wash the apostles' stripes. That was periling the soul of one man for a little bodily comfort of two others, if it is true, as the theory teaches, *no baptism, no salvation*.

Paul's answer to the jailer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved;" the marvelous change that came over the jailer before his baptism, and the incidental way in which his baptism is mentioned, are all irreconcilable with the hypothesis that his salvation was dependent upon his baptism. But if the statements relating to this case may be interpreted in the light of other scriptures, then the pretense that he was in a state of condemnation until his baptism, is simply an unmitigated absurdity.

6. *Baptism without regeneration*. A notable instance of this is the case of Simon the sorcerer. This is a troublesome case with the friends of baptismal salvation. Some assume that his baptism brought him into a state of salvation, but that he apostatized; others that his faith was originally defective, and therefore his baptism failed of its design. What are the evidences of his regeneration?

(a) It is said (Acts VIII, 13): "Then Simon himself *believed* also: and when he *was baptized*, he continued with Philip, wondering," etc. But the law is "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Therefore Simon was saved. This argument would be conclusive if the word "believe" was taken in the same sense in both propositions. But faith without works is dead. Many are represented as believing that were not saved, because their faith was defective. "Many *believed* in his name when they saw the miracles which he did. But Jesus did not *commit* himself unto them because he knew all men."—John II, 23, 24. These men

believed in Jesus, but Jesus did not believe in them (the words "believed" and "commit" are in the original the same), because he knew their faith was defective—their hearts were not right.

So, also, many of the chief rulers *believed* on him, but because of the Pharisees, did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue, etc. (John xii, 42, 43.) "King Agrippa believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest."—Acts xxvi, 27. Here we have a grade of faith which had no power to save. Such evidently was Simon's faith—a cold assent to the truth, accompanied with a purpose to make merchandize of the gospel.

It should be known to all that the word *faith*, as used in the New Testament, is expressive of very different psychological states of the mind; as faith, an act of the intelligence, without emotion and without volition; as faith with emotion, but without volition; and as faith with emotion and with volition. This last degree is the faith the gospel requires—is saving, purifying faith. It is trust, and trust in Christ alone, that saves.

Thousands have faith in God, in Christ, in the Scriptures, who do not even desire to be Christians; other thousands having this faith, also desire to be Christians. Such is the condition of all seekers or inquirers for the way of salvation, but it is only those that trust in Christ, and in him alone, that are saved.

Simon evidently believed there was a supernatural power in the religion preached by Philip, and also believed it available for secular purposes. That he trusted in Christ for salvation with a pure heart, he gave no evidence whatever.

The following facts seem to set this question beyond rational doubt:

1. "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money."—(Verse 20.) It is certain that Simon looked upon the gospel as some higher form of sorcery than any with which he was familiar, and it is certainly true that one having such a conception of the gospel could not be under its saving power.

The imprecation of Peter upon his money carries with it the implication of the deepest unregeneracy.

2. "Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter."—(Verse 21.) Peter here sharply discriminates between part (*μέρος*) and lot (*κλῆρος*). The idea is that Simon had no saving interest nor official part in this gospel (*λόγῳ*).

3. "For thy heart is not right in the sight of God." To be wrong-headed is a great calamity, but to be wrong-hearted shows the deepest depravity. The error of Simon was not one of judgment, but of a judgment under the dominion of a bad heart. The judgment is often wrong when the heart is right, but here the heart and judgment are both wrong.

4. "Thou art in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity."—(Verse 23.) These strong words denote the deepest guilt and condemnation.

Still the advocates of the water theory esteem his sin as of no great turpitude—only a "thought of thy heart" which was not consummated.

It may also be truthfully said that a deliberate purpose to commit theft or murder is only a thought of the heart, and it is, both in ethics and law, the thought that constitutes the theft or the murder; and though Simon's purpose was not carried into practical effect, it, as an act of the mind, was fully consummated and failed of outward execution only because of want of physical ability on his part. This, therefore, is no mitigation of the offense. But how a regenerate and holy heart could form such a purpose, is not the least of the troublesome questions suggested by the case.

To save the water theory in this case, four things have to be assumed: (a) that Simon was actually regenerated in baptism; (b) that the doctrine of apostacy is true; (c) that Simon actually lapsed into the deepest unregeneracy; (d) that baptism, though necessary to his first regeneration, was not necessary to his second regeneration, as Peter did not require him to be rebaptized in order to his re-regeneration; but only to repent and pray, if perhaps the thought of his heart might be forgiven him. But the calamity is, not one of these assumptions can be

established with absolute certainty. How desperate, then, must be a theory which rests upon a batch of unproved and unprovable postulates? What sane and prudent man can afford to risk his soul's salvation upon such loose logic?

But this fourth ascription (*d*) carries with it some speciousness, and is readily accepted by many as true, and therefore demands some examination.

It is readily admitted that baptism once administered need not be repeated. If baptism is not *in order to* remission, but is only declarative of faith and of consecration to God, then we can see no propriety in repeating it for any cause whatever; but if it is necessary to forgiveness in any case, how happens it not to be so in all? This question perplexes us. Has God different methods of forgiving sins? If so, why? Repentance, we know, is always required in order to forgiveness, but if baptism is equally a condition of forgiveness before conversion, as the theory alleges, why is it not equally necessary for the forgiveness of sins committed after conversion? Simon certainly was as deeply involved in guilt and condemnation after his baptism as before it, and if he could not be forgiven in the first instance without baptism, how could he be forgiven in the second instance without it? Is there anything peculiar in sins committed after baptism that supercedes the necessity of baptism? If so, what is it? If it should be said that having become a child of God by repentance and baptism, the advocacy of Christ is sufficient to deliver from sin without rebaptism: then it is sufficient to reply, that if the advocacy was not sufficient to prevent Simon's sin, how could it deliver from it? If it should be said that the gospel requires baptism but once, we cheerfully admit the answer, but admit it only because baptism is never a condition of forgiveness, and demand, if a condition in one case, why not so in all? Who can show the reason?

Mr. Campbell, as also Dr. Curtz and most other advocates of baptismal regeneration, make the efficiency of baptism dependent on a true faith. [Whether the faith which satisfies them is such as the gospel requires is not now under

discussion.] Hence, no true faith, no regeneration in baptism.

It is certainly true that "without faith it is impossible to please him (God)," and "whatsoever is not of faith is sin;" so that baptism or any other act without faith, would be sinful and offensive to God.

We can very readily conceive how baptism, considered as an individual act of the man, will be right or wrong, virtuous or vicious, according to the motive or purpose whence it proceeds, and if baptism is in this sense a condition of remission, then, of course, every act of obedience is, also, a condition of forgiveness, and salvation is by works—a doctrine at war with the Bible.

This, then, certainly is not the sense in which faith gives efficiency to baptism.

But if we consider baptism as a divine ordinance, which is the truth, the question forces itself upon us, How can a human act, as faith or any other act, physical or mental, give efficiency or power to such divine ordinance? We can readily see how faith can make an external act, as baptism, morally right or wrong, as said above, but how it can give baptism power to take away sin, exceeds our power of comprehension. If baptism has power to take away sin, it receives that power from God and not from faith. The truth is, that these gentlemen have misconceived the philosophy of their own theory, for if baptism is a divinely appointed condition of remission of sin, and Simon was baptized according to the apostolic methods, and yet failed to receive remission of sin, the defect manifestly was in his faith and not in his baptism, and it is, consequently, a mis-statement of the facts to say the efficiency of baptism depends upon the faith—it being certainly true that faith itself purifies the heart independent of baptism.

This is the vital error of all schemes of ritualistic salvation: the faith that trusts directly to Christ for salvation is lost sight of, and men come to trust in forms and ceremonies and church ordinances for what faith in Christ alone can give—reconciliation to God and moral fitness for heaven.

Men who, having a common historic faith in Christ, may be

persuaded that if they will confess their sins, or do penance, or be baptized, that they will be saved, mistake this hypothetical faith for the faith that purifies and saves. Such a faith, if it is lawful to call it faith, is not trust in Christ, but trust in works—in confession, or penance, or baptism; and while it may bring quiet to a misguided conscience, is necessarily illusive. This was just the condition of the Jewish nation in the days of Christ, and notably so of Saul of Tarsus.

Regeneration without baptism. “But one of the malefactors, which were hanged, railed on him, saying, If thou be Christ save thyself and us. But the other answering rebuked him, saying, Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly, for we receive the due reward of our deeds; but this man hath done nothing amiss. And he said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.”—Luke xxiii, 39-43.

Few texts, perhaps, have been more tortured than has this in the interest of theological vagaries. It teaches, by implication, that the mind is capable of existence, and of the performance of its appropriate functions, independent of the physical senses. Hence those that deny this doctrine have been tempted, some to reject the text altogether, as Marcion and the Manichees are said to have done, and others to explain away its true sense. “In order to do this, a comma is placed after *σήμερον*, to-day, and then our Lord is supposed to have meant, Thou shalt be with me after the resurrection; I tell thee this *to-day*.”—A. CLARKE.

The text also teaches, in the most explicit and satisfactory manner, salvation by grace through faith, without baptism or any other ritualistic observance. It, therefore, furnishes a practical exemplification of the fallacy of baptismal regeneration. This fact is keenly felt by the friends of this theory, to save which some resort to one method of evasion and some to another.

(a) Some allow that this malefactor was saved, but saved

VOL. I, NO. 2.—5.

before the setting up of the kingdom on Pentecost, and before Christian baptism was instituted.

We have not space for a full examination of this feeble attempt at evasion. It will suffice to say, that it assumes to be true, what needs to be proved, viz., that Christian baptism was not instituted till after the crucifixion, and that something was made necessary to salvation after that event that was not previously necessary, and that God has had at different times different modes of saving souls. Various other absurd things it also gratuitously assumes, in refutation of all which it is enough to state that salvation is *by grace through faith*; such it has always been, and from necessity, must ever be—from Abel to the close of time. (Heb. xi.)

(b) Another class that seek to set aside the force of this text for the sake of the baptismal theory, are those that make Paradise and hell, as used in Acts ii, 27, 31, refer to the same place or state, and hence when Christ said to the thief, “To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise,” his meaning was, To-day shalt thou be with me in hell. Thus the thief is sent to perdition to save water regeneration. This shocks all decency, and would not merit a serious reply but for the fact that thousands of uninformed persons have been misled by this sophistry. The passage (Acts ii, 25–31) is a quotation from David (Psa. xvi), and refers to Christ’s burial and resurrection, and not to his divinity nor to his rational soul or spirit. The text is so plain that none can mistake its general meaning, though some may be a little perplexed with some of its terms.

The word “soul,” *ψυχή*, is often used by the sacred writers for the natural life (Matt. ii, 20; vi, 25; xx, 28). The context clearly shows this to be the sense in Acts ii, 27, 31. The word *ἀδην*, here translated *hell*, means literally the invisible state into which disembodied souls enter, and comes very naturally to be applied to the grave, and is so translated (1 Cor. xv, 55): “O grave, where (is) thy victory!” But the rational soul or spirit of Christ was not in the grave at all.

Hades, the invisible world, includes both *Paradise* and *Gehenna*, or the place of torment; but *Paradise* and *Gehenna*

are never used interchangeably, nor are they applied to the same place or state. Paradise is used only three times in the New Testament—Luke xxiii, 43; 1 Cor. xii, 4; Rev. ii, 7. In 1 Cor. xii, 4, it is substantially equivalent to the third heaven.

Is the reader willing to believe that the third heaven and hell, the place of torment, are the same? or that Christ, when he said to the penitent thief, “To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise,” actually meant, *To-day shalt thou be with me in hell, the place of torment?*

It is written (Rev. ii, 8): “To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God.” Is the reader willing to believe that “the tree of life is in the midst of” hell, the place of torment? Is he willing to believe that the righteous, who overcome the world, the flesh, and the devil, shall be rewarded for their virtue by eating of the tree of life in the midst of hell?

Again, the thief prayed for a participation of Christ’s kingdom. Does any sane man affect to believe that Christ’s kingdom is either in the grave or in the place of torment? And again, Jesus, when expiring, commended his spirit into the hands of his Father. (Luke xxiii, 46.) Does any man pretend to believe that the words “into thy hands,” were intended to mean hell? and that thither Christ descended, carrying the thief with him, in answer to his prayer?

Now let the reader specially note that every one of these questions must, from logical necessity, be answered in the affirmative, or else he must concede that the thief was not lost but saved, and saved, too, without ritual baptism.

S. G. BURNETT.

ART. III.—THE ETHICS OF ST. PAUL.

Six miles from where the Cydnus, an important river of Cilicia, pours its cold waters into the Midland sea, stands the once beautiful but now decayed and forsaken city of Tarsus. Though its ancient grandeur and glory have yielded to the ravages of time, and its architectural beauties are hidden by the accumulated dust of centuries, its fame must coexist with the epistles whose author was born there. While the name of Paul the apostle continues to be spoken, the city of Tarsus will have a place in history. No more can its name be disassociated with that of Paul, than the city of Bethlehem can be forgotten while the world continues to speak the name of Jesus. If, in the coming ages, the last vestige of Tarsus should be swept from the banks of the Cydnus, its denuded site would still be hallowed as the birthplace of Paul.

Tarsus, as Paul himself avers, was "no mean city." So great were its commercial, educational, and social privileges, that wealth, talent, and genius sought a residence there and were proud to call it their home. While Athens, in Greece, and Alexandria, in Egypt, were famous as centers of scientific and literary culture, Tarsus, by her untiring devotion to the cultivation of Greek literature and philosophy, won for herself the proud distinction of a successful rival. Being made a free city by Augustus, as a "reward for its exertions and sacrifices during the civil wars in Rome," it was thereby exempted from the onerous political burdens which bore down with such force upon less favored cities. Urged forward by the stimulus of extraordinary advantages, both political and commercial, and not being altogether deaf to the voice of ambition, Tarsus made rapid progress in the race for preëminence.

At this city on the Cydnus, of Hebrew parents, "Saul of Tarsus" was born—born as others are born, but with a life-scene and destiny before him all his own. Endued by

nature with extraordinary intellectual powers, he entered upon life under the most hopeful and buoyant prospects. Unlike those of obscure birth and parentage, he was born to an inheritance, rich in all that learning could promise and wealth could command. When he reached the proper age to enter the schools of his native city, he found their doors wide open, and distinguished professors inviting him to step within. He found spread before him a sumptuous intellectual repast already prepared, as if in anticipation of his coming. With an innate thirsting for knowledge, he readily availed himself of the offered privileges. With a keen relish for intellectual food, and great powers of digestion, the road to eminence was of easy ascent.

Having a twofold purpose in view in writing this article, viz.: to speak of the ethical system presented in St. Paul's writings, and institute a comparison between it and the ethics of the ancient Greek and Roman philosophers, the reader will excuse what may seem a digression.

Ethics, or moral philosophy, as usually defined, is the science which teaches "what ought to take place in human conduct and actions, and why it should take place."

While there may have sprung up in the schools of Tarsus, numerous theories and speculations on the science of moral philosophy, it is more than probable that the philosophical writings of Socrates, Plato, and their contemporaries, as also those who lived before and after, were not unknown to the students of ethical science in that city. Paul's evident familiarity with the poetical writings of Aratus and Epimenides, which he quotes in his epistles, leaves little room for doubt as to his acquaintance with the writings of heathen philosophers. And that their doctrines had a potent influence in shaping the life of Paul, and determining his modes of thought, there is just as little room for doubt. Bound and fettered by a pseudo philosophy, and filled with Judaistic exclusiveness, he was ill prepared to accept the moral precepts of Christ.

"The first question in moral science is after an ultimate rule." There must be a tribunal of last appeal and of unquestioned jurisdiction. This tribunal must be invested

with power and authority to determine the moral quality of all human actions, and to decide all questions coming within the purview of ethical science. In the absence of such supreme authority and power, no satisfactory adjustment of moral problems can ever be reached.

Among the ancient Greek and Roman philosophers, the number of "ultimate rules" of right, fell little below the number of philosophers themselves. Having no rule in common, each was at liberty to erect a standard in conformity with his own notions. With them, if I correctly interpret their theories, all originating power, all the moral forces, all authority in ethics, centered in man, no reference ever being made to any power or authority back of or above man.

"Pythagoras, who first attempted to introduce a scientific analysis into the details of practical wisdom, disdaining to reason, contented himself with uttering oracular precepts, linking his system with a mysterious symbolism of numbers." Opposed to Pythagoras and to Heraclitus, who stood side by side upon the one moral platform, appeared Democritus, who founded a "sensual ethical system, the out-growth of his atomic philosophical doctrines." "The sovereign good of man," taught Democritus, "is happiness, which consists in tranquil content. To be at once temperate, daring, and confident, and, never having done or wished anything absurd, to trust in fortune," was the sum and substance of his moral maxims. Defective as it may appear in the clearer light of Christian philosophy, the system of Democritus had not been equalled by any strictly scientific system prior to Socrates. "The highest aim," says a certain writer, "of the grammarians, rhetoricians, statesmen, metaphysicians, and moralists, from all the schools of Greek philosophy, was to inspire respect for high intellectual attainments."

Socrates, "the father of moral philosophy, affirmed the reality of the distinction between good and evil; that it was founded in nature, and not a mere conventional distinction. But wherein it consisted he did not precisely determine. His highest aim was to exalt reason and give it the predominant controlling force in the world of thought. While he

made duty supreme, he failed to define virtue. Like all other moral philosophers of antiquity, he confounded ethics and politics, and was a preacher of virtue in the interest of the state."

Both the Socratic and Platonic systems of philosophy fall into the monstrous mistake of making vice the "involuntary product of ignorance." Aristotle gave morality no foundation in absolute science. His ethical system recognized nothing beyond the limited domain of politics. "He made virtue a civil instead of a moral quality, to be developed only in the state." Diogenes placed the highest power of virtue in the strength to endure privations, and in independence of social relations. Cleanthes and Epictetus declared force to be the only virtue. Epicurus, in his ethical philosophy, makes a state of passionless repose the highest attainable degree of virtue.

"During the first Christian century," says the American Cyclopedias, "stoicism predominated in intellectual theories, and philosophers of all schools, poets, historians, and rhetoricians, spoke, like Seneca and Epictetus, of the sacred love of the world, of the equality of man, of universal law, and of a universal republic."

While the works of the ancient schools of ethical science were not wholly bad, but rather fruitful in valuable social and political results, it must be conceded that their loftiest conception of genuine morality fell far below the recognized standard of Christian ethics. They had no elevating, ennobling, and purifying power. They acknowledged no existing relationship between man and his Maker. Like their authors, they were intensely human—mere human devices for the good of the State—without any reference to fitting men for the higher sphere of existence.

Prior to the advent of Christ and the promulgation of his doctrines, the human mind seems to have been fettered by a kind of sensualism, beyond the possibility of self-release. The heathen world needed the manifestation of some power to enlarge its field of thought, and bring within reach of its intellectual and moral vision, higher incentives and nobler motives to moral action. All that philosophy could do to

unfetter the heathen mind had been done, but without avail. The dark clouds of idolatry and superstition still remained. Philosophy was impotent to dispel them. It remained for Jesus, who "spake as never man spake," to widen and extend to hitherto unknown limits the domain of human thought.

Even the Jewish nation, to whom were "committed the oracles of God," and who were called his "peculiar people," appear to have made all their observations from a political, rather than from a moral standpoint. The higher moral position taken by Christ and his followers they neither understood nor appreciated.

In addition to Paul's supposed acquaintance with Greek literature and philosophy, his great mind was stored with all the learning current among his own people. At Jerusalem, in the school of Gamaliel, he acquired a knowledge of the law. Thus equipped for battle with opposing forces, and overflowing with a blind Pharisaic zeal, he entered the arena as the champion of Judaism and the avowed enemy of Christianity. To its utter extinction he devoted all his marvelous gifts and acquirements. As a bold and daring persecutor of Christians, he had few if any, equals. Like some half-famished beast in quest of prey, he made hurried journeys from city to city, thirsting for Christian blood, and longing for an opportunity to extort fresh wails of woe from Christian hearts. Such was "Saul of Tarsus."

The motive which impelled Paul to enter into a crusade against Christianity, was less a religious than a political one. In common with the Jewish nation, he, no doubt, feared the influence of Christianity upon their political, much more than upon their religious, institutions. "He has come," said they, "to take away our state and nation." It does not appear that they harbored any fears for Judaism, from any form of moral philosophy supposed to have been taught in their schools, nor yet for their social system, but solely for their "state and nation."

Whatever virtue may have rested in Judaistic morality, it certainly was wanting in power to control and subjugate human passions and prejudices. Instead of being the

master, it was the servile and cringing slave of social vices and secular interests. It was purely a state morality, taking cognizance of nothing beyond the geographical boundaries of Judea. It never realized any of those philanthropic impulses which stir and move the heart of the Christian moralist. From first to last, it was radically and essentially selfish. It saw no force in moral weapons. It never used them in its contests with the enemies of Judaism. The Jews knew no means of arresting the current of Christian thought but by persecuting or crushing the thinker. When they saw Jesus hanging upon the cross, they thought their institutions free from danger. Their death-dealing morality had won the day.

Any system of morality which can justify "persecution for opinion's sake," lacks all the essential elements of ethical orthodoxy; and yet Paul, whom we may safely regard as a typical Judaistic moralist, could persecute men and women to the death for believing in Christ, and think he was thereby serving God. What a preposterous delusion! What a strange infatuation!

Such a system of ethics as seems to have prevailed anterior to the introduction of the Christian era, and during the first century or two, could not long endure the light of Christ's precepts. They could not coexist. They had little in common.

If I have not failed in producing a truthful delineation of the great apostle's life and character, it will appear obvious to the reader that "Paul the apostle" had much to unlearn, which "Saul of Tarsus" had learned amiss. To become an efficient factor in the great work to which he was pre-ordained, of turning the current of human thought into a new channel, and elevating men to a higher plane of moral purity, he must himself step upon that plane. Laying aside his early training, except so far as it can be made to subserve the new order of things, he must enter the school of Christ and study the rules of his kingdom. Judaism, Phariseeism, false philosophy, together with all his national and tribal prejudices, must be laid at the foot of the cross, never more to be taken up. He was to array himself in open hostility

against his own people, in the overthrow of their cherished institutions. All his brilliant prospects of honor and promotion must be sacrificed upon the altar of the new relation. Truth must be divorced from error, and the former must be sustained at the expense of all earthly interest.

In allying himself to the kingdom newly set up, Paul made no reserve. He devoted the whole of his marvelous manhood to the overthrow of error and the propagation of truth. Saul, whose very name was a terror to the adherents of the new faith, and the sound of whose voice was to them like the knell of death, became, under the transforming power of God, the loving and gentle Paul. The bold and fearless persecutor exchanges places with the persecuted; and with the bloody hand of Nero in the distance, outstretched to strike the fatal blow, he shrank not from the impending doom.

As Paul failed to leave on record any formal statement or digest of his ethical opinions, we are left to the alternative of inference and deduction in the prosecution of our purpose. Accepting the life of the apostle as a fair, practical interpretation of his ethical doctrines, we must assign them a place far in advance of those of his predecessors and contemporaries. While they left unapproached the higher capabilities of man's moral nature, and fostered, rather than curbed, his selfish tendencies, Paul's system was at war with all the moral evils which were to be found interwoven with the social, political, and religious institutions of his day.

As soon as Paul stepped across the line which marked the boundary of Judaistic morality and separated it from Christianity, he adopted as his ultimate rule of action, the highest known ethical science. "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" With the most perfect self-negation, he seeks only to know the will of God; having learned which, he seeks only to do it. Without even the semblance of hesitation, he espouses the very cause he was commissioned to overthrow. He "conferred not with flesh and blood;" but ignoring these, together with all the ethical dogmas and speculations of Greek and Roman philosophers, he takes a step in advance of the ancient schools, and makes the law of God

the only unerring standard of moral action. Seated low at the feet of the Great Teacher, he drinks in the words of wisdom as they fall from his sacred lips, until his whole life is "hid with Christ in God."

Having noticed in general the moral position taken by Paul on the day of his miraculous conversion, it may now be proper to descend to particulars, and observe a few of the many striking exemplifications of his moral precepts, furnished by his "manner of life." Between his theory and practice there was no conflict. He knew no rule of action but the one he had chosen. Nor did he ever try to place upon the necks of other men a yoke which he himself was unwilling to bear. Rather would he have carried burdens not his own.

Had Paul been an ambitious aspirant to temporal honors, opportunities were not wanting for the highest gratification of that spirit. Even the offer of a place among the heathen deities, after the Roman custom, was made to him by the people of Lystra; but this offer of deification, which, to weaker men, would have borne with it a strong temptation, Paul rejected with pious scorn. When he healed the Lystrian cripple, the people said, "The gods are come down to us in the likeness of men." They gave Barnabas the name of Jupiter, and Paul they called Mercurius. "Then the priest of Jupiter, which was before their city, brought oxen and garlands unto the gates, and would have done sacrifice with the people. Which when the apostles, Barnabas and Paul, heard of, they rent their clothes, and ran in among the people, crying out, and saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? We are also men of like passions with you, and preach unto you that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God, which made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein."—Acts XIV.

To have yielded to this great temptation would have been a practical renunciation of his faith in Christ and an open endorsement of idolatry. For this, Paul was not prepared. His moral principles were too deeply rooted to be thus rudely torn up. Instead of being elated with the offer of a place in the Pantheon, among the gods and goddesses of the

heathens, he realized a feeling of the deepest mortification. Where men of less moral stamina would have hesitated, and parleyed with the tempter, Paul promptly declines the proffered honor, and condemns the worship of all beings but God. On the island of Melita, he passed through a like ordeal, with like results. No temptation, however adroitly aimed, could ever pierce the joints of his moral armor. No better commentary upon his writings than that furnished by his life will ever be written. What moral grandeur and sublimity were displayed in his conduct on the two occasions above referred to. He seemed superhuman while he refused to be called a God.

Ethical science, or moral philosophy, as taught in the schools, is treated as an abstraction, without any reference to the influence that an act, or a series of acts, may have in forming or modifying the characters of moral agents. All acts, good *per se*, fall within the limits of justifiable procedure. That is to say, any act which is *right*, may safely be put forth, without stopping to forecast its immediate or remote consequences. For the purpose of merely ascertaining and noting the moral quality of actions, the work of the schools is quite sufficient. But Paul was not a systematic teacher of ethical science. Overstepping the established boundaries, he guards his readers against the possible evils which may result from acts approved by the highest rule of right. No moral philosopher would undertake to say that the use of meat was morally wrong; yet Paul would abstain from its use throughout his whole life, rather than by eating "cause a brother to offend." Nor would he thus refrain from the use of meat from mere prudential considerations, nor as a dictate of "worldly wisdom," but for the reason that he might, by eating, cause the ignorant and superstitious to do wrong. This rule, strictly adhered to, would do much to free the Church of this day from many things that are liable to severe criticism.

Not only does Paul condemn that which is manifestly evil in itself, but that which is so only in appearance. "Abstain from all appearance of evil."—1 Thess. v, 22. Whatever opinion the Christian moralist may hold relative to the moral

quality of a given act, he should never put forth such act, knowing that it will have the appearance of evil in the eyes of others. Though it may be difficult, or even impossible, to prove that certain things are wrong, it is quite enough to know they are so regarded by many whose opinions are entitled to respect. It is not sufficient that we be prompted by pure motives. Others cannot see our motives—they judge us by what we do. Among subjects which come under this general class, may be named the opera, the ball-room, games of chance, games of hazard, church fairs and festivals, as usually conducted, together with many others, which need not be named here. Even though we may have no personal doubts as to the entire moral fitness of a given course of conduct, Paul would dissuade us from pursuing it, on the ground of its appearing to be evil to those less capable of judging. "It is always safe to lean to the side of virtue." Weighed in the ethical balance of St. Paul, even the Church, to say nothing of our social and political systems, would be found wanting. The so-called liberalism of the present day, lauded to the skies by popular ministers, and supported by influential journals, is the bane of the Church.

The papal doctrine that "the end sanctifies the means," found no place in Paul's ethics. Stirred with righteous indignation at the report that he justified evil when it promised good results, he repels the charge as false and slanderous.

The enemies of the apostle and his doctrines, as well as some of his professed friends, have charged him with dissimulation and deceit; the former for the purpose of neutralizing his moral precepts, and the latter to justify their own duplicity. In support of their charge, they are wont to quote 2 Cor. xii, 16: "Nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile." This language, instead of being Paul's own, as the general reader is apt to suppose, is, no doubt, that of his calumniators. At least, we regard this as a logical conclusion from what follows. In verses 17 and 18, Paul proceeds to refute the slander. Says Albert Barnes, in his notes on this place, "Paul appeals boldly to the facts,

and to what they knew. ‘Name the man,’ he says, ‘who has thus defrauded you under my instructions. If the charge is well founded, let him be specified, and let the mode in which it was done be distinctly stated.’ . . . The phrase, ‘make a gain,’ means properly to have an advantage; then to take advantage—to seek unlawful gain. Here Paul asks whether he had defrauded them by means of any one whom he had sent them.” No enlightened reader of Paul’s epistles, with his life of singular purity in view, can ever believe him capable of double-dealing or deceit.

The generous spirit of accommodation shown by Paul, when associated with persons of opposite opinions, on different questions—questions of no vital importance—has been tortured into a moral obliquity by the foes of Christianity. In 1 Cor. ix, 19–22, Paul says: “I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.”—Verse 22. By no fair and candid interpretation can Paul be made to say, “I have so far yielded to the force of popular prejudices and opinions as to approve wrong-doing, that I may succeed in my ministrations.”

Opposition to the spread of the gospel being very violent and determined, great wisdom and prudence were necessary in efforts to overcome it. Paul saw that a radical change was not to be effected by violently assailing the deep-rooted and cherished opinions of his hearers. To thus assail them were only to provoke a more determined resistance. To be “made all things” to them, without doing violence to truth and conscience, was the only truly philosophical plan of approach. In every moral contest the first aim should be to disarm opposition. This done, victory is more than half achieved. The mild garb of love and charity is much less repulsive than the scaled armor of the grenadier. If, by seeming to surrender certain offensive though not material opinions, Paul could allay the prejudices of the people and secure their attention, such a course would be entirely proper and right. While no intention, however pure, can justify an infraction of the moral law, we may rightly hold in abeyance offensive tenets in order to successfully inculcate

vital truths. This, but nothing more, could be laid to Paul's charge. He withheld no essential truth. His apparent simulation of the modes and manners of the people, never was permitted to degenerate into impropriety, much less into actual wrong-doing.

After infidelity and all the various forms of unbelief have exhausted all their powers of vicious criticism, in efforts to overthrow the moral structure reared by St. Paul, it will still remain, what it has ever been, the purest and grandest of its kind. Like the star that guided the wise men of the East to the birth-place of the Christ-child, it moves in an orbit all its own. Eccentric though that orbit may seem, it has for its center the will of God. To this is its appeal always and ever. To this "ultimate rule," every human action must be brought for trial.

That ethical science took a step upward and forward in the apostolic age, no one can doubt. In the ante-apostolic ages, moral philosophy never ventured beyond individual and state considerations. It was selfishness and politics combined. It left untouched man's moral powers, and sought only to control and regulate his outer life. The ethics of St. Paul had a more profound meaning, and a more comprehensive range. It embraced even the thoughts and intentions of men, without overlooking their actions.

WM. CAMPBELL.

ART. IV.—SANCTIFICATION.

God is not the author of confusion. Conflict and error there cannot be in the breathings of the Holy Ghost. The great principles of the moral government of Jehovah are, like himself, unchangeable in their nature and uniform in their application. The fundamental doctrines of grace are in perfect union, yet as distinct as the offices of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other;" yet there is no blending or intermixture; but each retains its own individuality, and remains lord in its own domain. God is sovereign and man is free; God is the first great cause and man is a secondary cause; the former will not, and the latter cannot usurp the prerogatives of the other. All the parts of the system of redemption are interdependent, yet independent; each is an essential unit in the grand aggregate. They meet but do not "overlap;" they embrace but do not mix. Sanctification, justification, regeneration, and growth in grace, have each their own identity and special sphere of operation. Each, in its own orbit, revolves without conflict around their central orb, "the Sun of righteousness." All are indispensable to the perfect system, but "one star differeth from another star in glory." The succeeding begins where the preceding ends, yet is not the mere continuation of the preceding, for each is complete in itself.

Sanctification is not justification, nor is either, nor both combined, regeneration. Sanctification is not growth in grace, nor is it the continuation and ultimate of regeneration. These terms stand for great, distinctive doctrines, and are not interchangeable. God's unerring linguist does not employ terms ambiguously in the annunciation of the plan divine for saving sinners, "for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God." His enunciations of the essential parts of the method of salvation must be simple

and definite. Speaking to men, and employing their language, he must use terms that have to them a fixed and well ascertained meaning. Simple justice to man demands that the standards of the sanctuary have a uniform and settled value, otherwise the will of the Law-giver cannot be certainly known. Every science has its terminology, and its devotees are constantly striving to render more simple and definite its classifications and technicalities. God is better than man. His infinite wisdom dictated the enunciations of the science divine, and no revision is necessary, "*a parte Dei.*" A term of well ascertained signification in the first edition of his revealed will, needs no new dress in the subsequent one. Hence, the primary signification of the same terms in both must be the same. The bare ideas must run through the whole of Revelation, whether dressed in Hebraic simplicity or expressed in classic or New Testament Greek. This must necessarily be so. The sovereign is the same, the subjects are the same, their necessities are the same, the law is the same, redemption is the same, and the means the same.

That great vagueness, confusion, and contradiction exist on this subject, is attested by the writings of theologians representing different systems of doctrine. The agitation of the minds of many on this subject bespeaks interest. By some sanctification is said to be regeneration, while others try to distinguish between regeneration in its incipiency and sanctification as its completion. It is regeneration and it is not. The germ is implanted and sanctification in its progressive development produces the matured and perfected growth. By others it is defined to be perfected holiness in the entire man, for which we must strive through life, yet we can never attain it. Some say it is not only attainable in this life, but we have it "in all its seven degrees," and "are as pure and holy, internally and externally, as Jesus Christ, and the works he did, and greater works, we can do." Some say it is a second regeneration, and its bestowal is as instantaneous as in the first birth. Others teach it is progressive, and the joint work of God and man. Some say that without sanctification, or perfected holiness, a justified

and regenerated soul will be damned; and others tell us, Without you become "internally as pure as God's service in heaven" (which is as pure as himself), "you cannot enter heaven;" which amounts to the same thing, for there is no "Thus saith the Lord" for the opinion that death will confer it, or that God will confer it after death. Writers confound and mix it up with regeneration, justification and growth in grace. They try to distinguish, yet confound them.

The active thought of the present age is seeking for a solution of these difficulties, and striving to bring order and beauty out of chaos. The very extremes to which some have gone; the sacriligious fanaticism; the bloody hands of the father dripping with his child's gore; the rupture of family ties; the disregard of conjugal chastity and the renunciation of marriage vows; the good of man and the honor of God's holy word, all demand forgetfulness of creeds and text-books for the while, and an earnest effort to ascertain "the mind of the Spirit;" that we should "speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth," "comparing *spiritual things with spiritual.*"

In my conception, the error and confusion on this doctrine have their fountain-head in a partial and incorrect definition. The primary signification of the term has been set aside for its consequent or secondary meaning.

Sanctification has been defined to be "the act of making holy," without reference to the nature of that holiness and its antecedent. This definition is partial and incorrect, as its uniform classical signification and the general usage of the sacred writers attest. Those who thus define are compelled to admit that as used in the Bible, the exceptions to their definition are more than ten to one.

The words sanctify, sanctification, saints, sacrifice, etc., are derived from a common source, the Latin adjectives *sacer* and *sanctus*, in composition with *facio*, to make, to do, etc.

The lexicographers define *sacer*, sacred, consecrated, religious, venerable, admirable, not common, dedicated to the gods, inviolable, holy.

Sanctus, the past participle of *sancio*, is defined in the same terms. Both are applied to all buildings, places, things, and persons devoted to the gods, whether by usage or certain statutes; or to such places and things as have become inviolable, because of their sacredness; as the walls and gates of a city, sepulchres, oaths, kings, etc.; also to things and persons that are venerable or celebrated; as "*sancti ignes*," sacred fires; "*sanctissimum consilium*," the most sacred or holy council, by the Roman Senate. The quality of moral purity, or abstract holiness, is absent; so much so that anything or person devoted to the infernal deities, and consequently to death, as a sacrifice, was said to be *sacer* or *sanctus*, sacred; hence, impious, detestable, infamous, accursed. This adjective, bearing this primary and general signification, enters into the composition of all the terms used in this connection, and indelibly stamps its uniform meaning upon them all. The verb *facio* has nothing of a sacred or holy signification in itself: it is only the servant of *sacer* and *sanctus*; hence, all the compounds, *sacro*, *consecro*, *sancio*, *sanctifico*, etc., are all similarly defined, viz., to make sacred, to consecrate, to dedicate, to set apart from common to sacred purposes, to devote or appropriate to the service of religion, whether Pagan or Christian.

The nouns, *sanctitas*, *sanctificatio*, *sanctitudo*, etc., express the state, condition, or action of their primitives. A similar class of words are used in connection with the offerings by fire: *sacrificus*, *sacrificium*, *sacrifico*, etc. In the sacrifices the idea of consecration culminated. Literally and primarily, to sacrifice is to make sacred; secondarily and tropically, to doom to death the animal in the offerer's stead, bearing symbolically his sins, and by its death expiating his guilt; hence, it was regarded as infamous and accursed. On the great day of atonement, in the Mosaic economy, sacrifice reached its highest form. One goat was to be slain—a sin offering, a thing accursed; the other bore the sins of the people into the wilderness, the supposed home of the evil one; a thing so unholy and accursed that the one who led him into the wilderness must purify himself before he could reenter the camp. (*Vide Lev. xvi.*) But in this transaction

the primary idea of consecration is paramount—the animal devoted to death in the place of the people. So Christ consecrated himself to death and “bore” the sins of the people. “For their sakes I sanctify myself.” “Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify (consecrate) the people with his own blood suffered without the gate,” as their sin offering.

The inevitable conclusion is, that whatever was dedicated to God, or his service, became, by virtue of its consecration, sacred, but not morally and “internally as pure as God,” nor sinless, nor abstractly holy; hence, it could not be profaned by using it for a common purpose; hence, in the Mosaic ritual the flesh offered in sacrifice, when unconsumed, could be eaten only by the priests, the sacerdotes—literally, sacred gifts—or sacred ones, because it was *most holy*. The sacrifices possessed no inherent or imported holiness. They were destitute of, and incapable of, moral quality, both before and after the offering; but because they had been consecrated to God and his service, they were *judicially declared holy*. Consecration is the antecedent, and judicial holiness the consequent. The word “sanctification” is derived from *sanctificatio*, and that expresses the act of the participle *sanctus* and the verb *facio*, which we have seen uniformly means to make sacred, venerable, etc.

The English word, then, to be a correct translation of the Latin term, must necessarily mean the act of consecrating, of making sacred, and not of making morally or “internally as pure” as God or “the service of heaven.”

In the Greek, *hieros* and *hagios* are the equivalents of *sacer* and *santus*. *Sacro* is the equivalent of *hiero* and *aphiero*, *kathairo*, etc., or *consecro*; *hagiazo*, *hagiasma*, and *hagiasmos* are respectively the equivalents of *sancio*, *sanctifico*, and *sanctificatio*; of which similar definitions are given by the lexicographers.

Liddell and Scott define *hagiazo*, to hallow, to purify, to consecrate, of persons.

Worcester defines “to hallow,” to consecrate, to make holy, to dedicate, to sanctify, to devote. 2. To honor as sacred, to reverence as holy.

Hagiasma—“that which is hallowed, a holy place, a sanctuary.” So used in the Septuagint.

Hagiastis—“consecration, sanctification.”—Rom. vi, 19.

The same primary signification runs through them all, viz., consecration, making sacred, dedication to religious uses; with the same consequent sacredness attaching to the persons and things consecrated.

In the Hebrew, terms of similar import, and similar applications, are employed. The radical form, *godash* or *godesh*, Gesenius defines, “To be pure, clean; in a proper sense; physical purity and cleanliness; perhaps kindred to *chadah*, of which the primary idea is ‘to be bright.’ Hence (2) to be holy, sacred, *sanctus*; so in all the kindred dialects.”

Primarily, therefore, it refers to physical purity or cleanliness, and the idea of moral purity is excluded.

In its secondary use, the terms, “holy,” “sacred,” and “*sanctus*” are interchangeable. Gesenius proceeds to give examples of its usage, as he has defined its secondary meaning.

1. “Of a person who consecrates himself to God, and so regards himself as holier than the profane vulgar. Isa. LXV, 5: ‘Stand by thyself, come not near to me, for I am holier than thou’—*gdashti lko*.” Very much like the holiness people, but yet no moral purity, as the previous verses show.

2. “Of those who are consecrated by touching sacred things. (Ex. xxix, 37; xxx, 29; Lev. vi, 11, 20.)” No internal purity.

3. “Of things destined for the sacred worship (Num. xvii, 2, 3; Ex. xxix, 21); or which are consecrated by the contact of sacred things (1 Sam. xxi, 6; Hag. ii, 12); or which are devoted to the sacred treasury (Josh. vi, 19).” He gives a variety of applications in the derived conjugations; as, “to hold sacred, to regard and treat as holy, to pronounce holy, to sanctify, begin, hallow, cleanse, purify, to show oneself holy or glorious, to be celebrated, kept;” but in not a single instance of the applications given, under these definitions, is the idea of intrinsic holiness, sinless perfection, or internal purity to be found.

The participle *godesh*, the equivalent of *sanctus*, so far

from signifying moral purity, is applied to male prostitutes. Deut. xxiii, 18; 1 Kings xiv, 24, and in other places, the only meanings given are, sacred, consecrated. The feminine form of the noun *godeshah*, is rendered "a female prostitute, harlot, properly one consecrated like the *godesh*, male prostitute, to the worship of Astarte or Venus, and the gains of whose prostitution went into the treasury of the temple of that goddess." It is so rendered in Gen. xxviii, 21, 22; Deut. xxiii, 18, and in Hos. iv, 14; and Gesenius cites these passages. Sodomites, catamites, and harlots certainly have no internal purity, but are infamous and detestable, though consecrated.

1. The noun is rendered, holiness, sanctity, and is applied to all classes of objects, rational and irrational.

Gesenius says: "Rarely only, and in doubtful examples, is it to be rendered as abstract holiness."

2. It is rendered "a holy thing, something sacred, consecrated to God." (1 Chron. xxvi, 20.) "The treasures of the dedicated things." No internal purity.

3. A holy place, sanctuary, tabernacle, temple, etc.

4. In its superlative or intensive form, *godesh*, *godoshim*— "holiness of holinesses," something most holy—it is applied principally to things without life.

The conclusion is irresistible that moral purity, abstract holiness, sinless perfection, is not the primary signification in any of its forms, but that consecration is; and that *declared holiness* is its secondary. We also see from the examination of the terms in three languages, in which the Scriptures are written, that sanctification is not regeneration begun or continued. Second, that it is not growth in grace, nor is it justification.

The English terms "sanetify," "sanetification," and "saints," are the equivalents of those already considered, and their primary significations must be identical, or else they are not correct translations. The primary meaning is consecration; the secondary is judicial holiness.

Uniform Bible usage sustains the lexicons.

The primary signification of sanctification, as used in the

Old Testament, is not abstract holiness, internal purity, or sinless perfection, but simple consecration.

Its secondary and consequent signification is judicial holiness, and not actual soul-perfection, or abstract holiness, or internal purity, or sinless perfection.

1. The only being intrinsically pure and absolutely holy, is said to sanctify himself and to be sanctified by men.

At least sixteen times are the terms predicated of Jehovah in the law and the prophets. Num. xx, 12: "Ye believe not to sanctify me;" Isa. viii, 13: "Sanctify the Lord of Hosts himself;" Ezek. xxxvi, 23: "I magnify myself, I sanctify myself;" Lev. x, 3: "I will be sanctified in them that come nigh me;" Isa. v, 16: "God that is *holy*, shall be sanctified in righteousness," etc., are examples.

2. Things already declared holy and most holy, are said to undergo the process of sanctification. 1 Chron. xxiii, 13: "Aaron was separated, that he should sanctify the most holy things, he and his sons forever."

Things *most holy* are to be sanctified by imperfect men.

3. The people, collectively, are commanded many times to sanctify themselves, and many times are said to have been sanctified. Lev. xi, 44: "Ye shall sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be holy: for I am *holy*."

ANALYSIS.—1. National consecration. 2. Judicial holiness. 3. The reason: because consecrated to a holy God. This is but a representative text. The whole nation is said to be sanctified. Is it possible that all men are regenerated? and not only regenerated, but had attained to sinless perfection? All the people are called saints, sanctified ones (*hagioi*), holy ones, thirty-four times, and oftener.

If these terms mean internal holiness in its perfection, what mean their fearful apostacies and terrible punishments?

4. Idolatrous nations are denominated by God himself, "My sanctified ones."

Isa. xiii, 3: "I have commanded my *sanctified* ones, I have also called my mighty ones for mine anger."

Who are these sanctified ones? Jeremiah explains (li, 28): "Prepare against her the nations, with the kings of the

Medes, the captains thereof, and all the rulers thereof, and all the land of his dominion."

Babylon is to be punished for her sins, and the Medes are summoned to execute his judgments, and hence are called his "sanctified ones."

No holiness is claimed for these, yet they are "sanctified ones." Is not the execution of the judgments of God against the wicked a holy service? Do not sinless angels perform this service? Are they not in the upper sanctuary? Yet here are heathen nations employed in the same service. How fallacious then the dictum, that "Man must be internally as pure as the service to which he is consecrated!"

5. The whole tribe of Levi and the family of Aaron are repeatedly commanded to sanctify themselves and to be sanctified and as often declared sanctified.

Ex. xix, 22: Let the priests sanctify themselves; xxviii, 41: Anoint and sanctify Aaron and his sons; 2 Chron. xxx, 15; The Levites ashamed, sanctified themselves, yet that they were sinful, the daily and yearly sacrifices offered for themselves attest. Even the high priest never reached the state in which he needed not forgiveness, and the daily prayer, "Forgive us our debts."

Of them the apostle says (Heb. vii, 19): "The law made nothing perfect." Heb. vii, 26-28: "For such an high priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, *separate from sinners*; who needeth not daily, as those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first, for his own sins, and then for the people's. For the law maketh men high priests which have *infirmitas*; but the word of the oath, maketh the Son, who is *consecrated for evermore*."

Note the apostolic contrast of the sinful high priests and the Sinless One. The sinful are said to be *sanctified*, and the sinless *consecrated* for evermore. Is it possible that the sanctification of the former contained elements of holier nature than the simple consecration of the latter?

6. All the first-born of Israel were to be sanctified to the Lord, both of man and of beast.

Ex. xiii, 2: "Sanctify unto me all the first-born, whatso-

ever openeth the womb among the children of Israel, both of man and of beast, it is mine."

Is not the sanctification of the first-born of man the same as that of the beast? Can moral quality be imparted to a beast? What can a child of eight days know of progressive holiness? What can this sanctification be but simply consecration?

The first-born of Israel having been preserved from the destroying angel on the night of the exodus, were considered redeemed, and were reckoned as things devoted to God. "It is mine;" and were to be set apart or sanctified to his service exclusively; but by a subsequent arrangement in the wilderness, the tribe of Levi was substituted for the first-born, and was exclusively devoted to the service of the sanctuary; and of this tribe the family of Aaron was selected for the priesthood. Num. viii, 14-19: "Thus shalt thou separate the Levites from among the children of Israel, and the Levites shall be mine: for they are wholly given unto me, from among the children of Israel, instead of the first-born of all the children of Israel, have I taken them unto me; for all the first-born of the children of Israel are mine; both of man and beast; on the day that I smote every first-born in the land of Egypt, I sanctified them for myself."

Here God is the sanctifier, and yet no internal purity required. Surely the old worship had something of purity in it. Surely an infinitely pure God could ordain only a pure worship for himself; yet the first-born of man, and a whole tribe, and a family are consecrated to that pure service, without being "internally as pure as the service to which they are sanctified," and without even the idea of progressive holiness.

7. The unborn child is said to be sanctified by God himself. Jer. i, 5: "Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee *a prophet* unto the nations." Is this sanctification anything else but appointment or consecration to the office of prophet? Surely the service attached to that office is a pure one, yet the unborn babe is sanctified to it. Has it been regenerated? Has it progressed in holiness?

Paul says (Rom. i, 1; Gal. i, 15): "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ; called to be an apostle, *separated* unto the gospel of God." "But when it pleased God, who *separated* me from my mother's womb and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me that I might preach him among the Gentiles."

Acts ix, 15: "He is a chosen vessel unto me to bear my name before the Gentiles." Here again is sanctification from the womb, without internal purity. Surely the preaching of the gospel is a pure service.

He is a chosen, a consecrated vessel, a sanctified vessel, yet not regenerated, yet not "internally as pure as the service to which he is consecrated" by God. And in his last days he says, I have not attained perfection.

8. Things irrational and material are said at least in fifty-eight places to be sanctified.

Houses, the tabernacle, the temple, with all their furniture, vessels, altars, clothes; fields, hills, mountains, fruits, bread, flesh, fasts, days, animals, offerings, etc., embracing all classes of objects that might be offered to God.

This sanctification can mean only consecration, and is so interpreted in 2 Chron. xxix, 33: "And the consecrated things (*haggodoshim*) were six hundred oxen and three thousand sheep."

Thus in all the subjects and objects said to be sanctified in the Old Testament, not one fills the definition to make holy, but all show that its primary signification is to consecrate, to make sacred, to set apart or appoint to the service of God.

Exclusive of God, all the agents and instrumentalities of sanctification exclude the conference of moral quality, internal purity, and abstract holiness, and thus demonstrate that its primary meaning is to consecrate.

1. God is said to sanctify. Of course he can confer internal purity, yet in every instance in which he is said to be either the subject or agent of sanctification, we have already seen the signification is not to make holy but to consecrate.

2. Men are said to sanctify other men and things.

Moses "sanctified Aaron and his sons;" Samuel, "Jesse and his sons." Job "santified his sons and daughters."

"Moses sanctified the people, the tabernacle and all that was in it." (See Ex. xix, 14; Lev. viii, 10, 15, 30; 1 Sam. xvi, 5; Job i, 5.) The men of Kirjath-Jearim sanctified Eleazar, the son of Abinadab, to keep the ark of the Lord.

Can one man regenerate or make holy others, and even a whole people? No; but he can, with their consent, consecrate them, and thus is sanctify interpreted by the Spirit. Ex. xix, 9, 29, 33: "And thou shalt consecrate Aaron and his sons." "And they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate, to sanctify them." "And the holy garments of Aaron shall be his sons' after him to be anointed therein, and to be *consecrated* in them." *Vide*, also, Judges xvii, 5, 12; 1 Kings xiii, 33; Micah iv, 18.

3. Priests, and people, and individuals are commanded to sanctify themselves, and are declared to be sanctified.

Ex. xix, 22: Let the priests sanctify themselves.

Lev. xi, 44: Ye shall sanctify yourselves.

Again we "compare spiritual things with spiritual." 2 Chron. xix, 31: "Then Hezekiah answered and said, Now ye have *consecrated* yourselves unto the Lord, come near and bring sacrifices and thank-offerings into the house of the Lord." Consecration was necessary before their offerings could be acceptable.

Ezek. xliv, 7: "Seven days shall they purge the altar and purify it. and they shall *consecrate* themselves."

4. Carnal ordinances and ceremonial observances are said to be the means of sanctification. The first-born by circumcision; adults by washings, oblations, and sacrifices, and other ceremonies; of all of which Paul says (Heb. ix) they "could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience."

The instrumentalities employed exclude the idea of moral purity, regeneration, justification, and growth in grace. Internally and morally, those sanctified were in the same condition after their consecration as before. There was still uncleanness on the person and impurity in the nature. Impurities were in the water with which they washed, in the blood they sprinkled, the victims slain, and in the

fire which consumed. These elements of sanctification could not purge the conscience.

My second proposition, viz., that the secondary signification is judicial holiness, and not actual soul-perfection, or abstract holiness, or internal purity, or sinless perfection, follows as a necessary and logical conclusion from the preceding argument.

This position is sustained by classic and Old Testament usage.

The first, classic usage, we suppose, will not be controverted. The gods and goddesses of the classics are the embodiment of all vices, and the services rendered to them were lustful, obscene, and debauching. Sodomites, catamites, and female prostitutes were numbered among their most sacred or holy ones. Waiving the argument drawn from the necessary uniformity of the signification of the language of men, whether used by their best writers, or Deity, in his communications to man, we propose to show by the actual use of the terms "holy," "most holy," and "holiness," in the Old Testament, the truth of the second proposition.

The terms are predicated of all orders of beings and all classes of objects. I have examined three hundred and twelve applications of the word "holy," as a verb and an adjective, in the Old Testament.

1. God is said to be holy. Of this there can be no controversy. He only possesses abstract and absolute holiness. All other intelligences are only relatively holy or judicially holy.

"There is none holy as the Lord." He alone is glorious in holiness. "Holy! holy! holy is the Lord God!" Angels or unfallen beings are only relatively holy. "His angels he charged with folly." The heavens are not clean in his sight. Fallen men and things can be only judicially holy.

The term "holy" is applied to the Godhead ninety-two times; sometimes representing his power and his glory in the bestowment of favors or in the execution of his judgments, etc. Four times it is ascribed as belonging to angels or unfallen spirits, who are only relatively holy. But the holiness of God and unfallen beings is not in controversy.

2. Deducting ninety-six from three hundred and twelve, we have the remainder of two hundred and sixteen. Of this number, the term "holy" is ascribed to things without life and moral quality, one hundred and eighty-five times; over one-half the number of times it is used in the Old Testament, or at least the number of places examined.

3. Twenty-five times the whole nation and the convocations of the people are said to be holy, "The congregation is holy"—the "nation is holy." It will not be controverted that judicial holiness is here meant.

4. The whole tribe of Levi and the family of Aaron are six times said to be holy. Again declarative or judicial holiness.

Of individuals it is predicated three times—one of Elisha, one of David, and one of any Nazarite. I suppose in none of these instances will abstract holiness or perfect moral purity be claimed. The case of the Nazarite explains the others. Num. vi, 18: "All the days of his separation he is holy unto the Lord, because the consecration of his God is upon his head." It cannot be moral purity, for his vow of separation only extended to the non-use of things allowed the holy people and the holy priesthood. 2. It was only for a specified time. 3. Might be terminated by an accident, such as the touching of a dead body, thereby losing his consecration and consequent holiness.

The superlative form *godesh, godoshim*—holiness of holinesses, something most holy—is predicated of Messiah once; five times to things, as incense, sacred utensils, altar, etc.; to places fourteen times, and to the sacrifices and offerings fourteen times. Thirty-three times out of thirty-four it is said of things destitute of life and incapable of moral purity.

The term "holiness" is ascribed to God seven times; seven times to the Mosaic ritual; eight times to places; and five times to other *things*.

What stronger proof could be adduced to sustain the second proposition? No wonder that the great Hebrew lexicographer says of *godesh*: "Rarely only, and in doubtful examples, is it to be rendered as abstract holiness."

That anything or person consecrated to God is only judicially holy, or regarded and treated as holy, and most holy, because of its prior consecration, God affirms himself.

Lev. xxvii, 28: "Notwithstanding, no devoted thing, that a man shall devote unto the Lord of all that he hath, both of *man* and *beast*, and of the field of his possession, shall be sold or redeemed. *Every devoted thing is most holy unto the Lord.*"

This is the Spirit's or God's exegesis: Of the sanctification of a man's house to be holy unto the Lord, in the fourteenth verse; of his field, in the sixteenth verse; of the beast, in the twenty-sixth verse; and the tithe of the land, in the thirtieth verse; and of all things that a man should consecrate to God.

I propose to trace the terms "sanctify," "sanctification," and "saints," through the New Testament, and to show that their signification is the same as in the Old Testament, and that the New corresponds to the old, as face to face in the polished mirror. It cannot be otherwise, for each is "the mind of the same Spirit;" the subjects are the same, their necessities the same, the object the same, the doctrines the same, the terms the same, and must have the same signification.

1. Sanctification does not signify primarily, the act or the process of making internally pure. It does not signify the process of, or attainment of, abstract holiness.

2. The terms "holy," "most holy," and "holiness," when attributed to fallen men and objects, signify judicial or imputed holiness, and not a holiness actually imparted into, or attained by, man and things. That imputed or judicial holiness is the consequent of the consecrating faith.

3. The same orders of intelligences and the same class of objects are said to be sanctified in the New as in the Old Testament.

4. Beings necessarily and absolutely holy and infinitely pure, from all eternity, are said to be capable of receiving sanctification, and to be actually sanctified.

(1) God the Father.

1 Peter III, 15: "But sanctify the Lord God in your hearts." Revere is the simple meaning.

(2) The Son.

John x, 36: "Say ye of him whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?"

John xvii, 19: "And for their sakes I sanctify myself."

1 Cor. i, 30: "Who of God is made unto us . . . sanctification."

In these passages the terms certainly harmonize with classic and Old Testament usage. Neither the Father nor the Son need regeneration or any process of holiness. The term can mean consecration only, and Paul so understands it. Heb. vii, 28: "For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law, maketh the Son who is *consecrated* for evermore." Heb. x, 20: "By a new and living way, which he hath *consecrated* for us, through the vail, that is to say, his flesh."

5. All disciples, the whole Church, all Christians, the people, are said to be sanctified.

All Christians are called *hagioi, sancti*—saints, the sanctified ones—at least sixty-one times. *Saints*, or sanctified ones, now; not to undergo a future process of sanctification.

John xvii, 17: "Sanetify them through thy truth: thy word is truth." Not only his then disciples, but all who should afterward believe on him.

Eph. v, 26: Christ also loved the *Church* and gave himself for it, "That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word."

1 Thess. v, 23: "The very God of peace sanctify you wholly in your whole spirit, soul, and body."

Heb. xiii, 12: "Wherefore Jesus that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate."

Acts xx, 32: "An inheritance among them that are sanctified."

1 Cor. i, 2: "Unto the Church of God, which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus called *saints*."

1 Cor. vi, 11: "Ye are sanctified in the name of the Lord."

Heb. ii, 11: "For both *he* that *sanctifieth* and they who are sanctified are all of one."

Heb. x, 10: "By the which will we are sanctified."

Heb. x, 14: "He *perfected* them that are sanctified."

Jude 1: "To them that are sanctified."

1 Thess. iv, 3: "Chosen you from the beginning to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth."

1 Peter i, 2: "Elect through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience, and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus."

In every single instance, bodies—the Church, all Christians—are addressed, and sanctification is predicated of the whole in all its parts. I have yet to find a single passage referring to individual subjective holiness or personal perfection. Their sanctification can only be consecration.

Whatever the term may denote, they are *all already sanctified*; they are not undergoing a process: they are not to be sanctified, but are now sanctified—saints!

6. Children are said to be sanctified.

1 Cor. vii, 14: "But now are they (*hagioi*) holy, saints, sanctified ones."

7. Unbelievers are said to be sanctified.

1 Cor. vii, 14: "For the unbelieving husband is *sanctified* by the believing wife, and the unbelieving wife by the believing husband."

Are all the wicked husbands of pious wives regenerated, or in process of perfected holiness, and *vice versa*?

8. Things without life are said to be sanctified.

Matt. xxiii, 17, 18. An exact copy of the sanctifications of the Old Testament.

The agents and instrumentalities of sanctification are the same.

1. The persons of the Godhead.

According to the generally received or holiness theory, sanctification in the New Testament is the peculiar work of the Spirit, commencing with regeneration and continued through life by the Spirit and the regenerated one, but never perfected until *one of the agents has ceased to act*. Hence, from their standpoint, when it is said to be the work of the Father or of the Son, logically it can mean neither regeneration, or perfected holiness, or its process.

The investigations in the Old and New Testaments show that when God the Father is said to sanctify, it signifies appointment, ordination, or consecration to some special use or mission.

2. When the Son is the sanctifier, it means simple consecration, or consecration combined with expiation for sin made by himself. In other words, he consecrates by his death, but does not regenerate, or bestow moral purity or internal holiness thereby. From the unity in essence and harmonious coöperation of the Three in One, the deduction is logical and necessary that these terms must have the same signification when used by either of the persons of the Godhead, or discord and ambiguity will result. This is unthinkable.

3. This conflict would inevitably produce confusion in the subjects for whose enlightenment the doctrines of grace were intended, and they could not know the mind of the Spirit by "comparing spiritual things with spiritual."

The Bible is its own commentator and interpreter. God the Father sanctified the Son to be the first-born among brethren; and whatever the term means when applied to the first-born, that it should mean when predicated of the "many brethren," or his collective people. Creation, whether attributed to the Father, or the Son, or the Spirit, means the same thing. Sin and its guilt are the same in the language of each of the three. Repentance and faith, required of men, have uniform significations. The "new heart" is the same thing when demanded by either person. Justification has an universal signification. So obedience. In all the great essentials, the persons of the Godhead speak face to face. Is it possible that in the use of the one term, "sanctification," there is confusion and discord?

2. Men sanctify themselves.

1 Cor. vi, 11: "And such were some of you, but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified."

The verbs "washed" and "sanctified," are in the middle voice of their respective originals, in which the agents of an

action act upon themselves, and the meaning is, "Ye have washed yourselves; ye have sanctified yourselves." No Greek scholar will call this in question.

3. Persons are said to sanctify others.

1 Cor. vii, 14: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband."

4. The word is said to sanctify.

Sanctify through thy truth; thy word is truth.

5. "The blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh."—Heb. ix, 13.

6. The blood of Christ.

Heb. xiii, 12: "That he might sanctify the people with his own blood."

7. Things without life sanctify other things.

Matt. xxiii, 17, 19: "The temple that sanctifieth the gold," "or the altar that sanctifieth the gift."

Again we have the exact usage of the Old Testament scriptures.

1. In all these applications of sanctification, and by these varied agencies, the Greek words are the identical terms which we are so dogmatically told primarily signify, "to make holy;" yet in all the cases enumerated, and in all the agencies employed (or at least seven out of eight), the only possible meaning is, to make sacred or consecrate, renew, appoint, etc.

2. In none of the sanctifications enumerated, and by none of its agents, can it possibly be regeneration, or internal purity in any of its stages.

3. In all, the action and its effect are perfected and completed. There is no future progression.

4. It is not affirmed in a single case of Bible sanctification, nor can it be logically deduced therefrom, that "man must be made internally as pure as the service to which he is consecrated," or "else he cannot enter heaven." No where in all God's word is it stated that "the use to which he is" exclusively "consecrated is eternal service in heaven, and to attain this use, his entire internal purification must be

perfect." No where is his internal purity or perfect holiness in "spirit, soul, and body," made the condition of salvation, justification, or admission into heaven; but it is most unequivocally announced, and emphasized, that faith is the only condition.

God alone is absolutely pure and infinitely holy. The worship and service which he prescribes for men and angels must be of the same *nature* and like himself. That service is essentially spiritual and pure, in whatever form it is clothed or by whatever symbols taught. Neither time nor place gives character to that service, but the being served. "Ye shall be holy, for I, the Lord, your God, am holy." The imperfections of the worshipers cannot affect the purity of the service; nor can there be one service of less purity for men on earth and another of higher purity for men saved. Man is consecrated to that service here on earth, and God has said of it that it is most holy, in whatsoever place at whatsoever time, and by whomsoever rendered. God denominates the old service the perfection of holiness in all its parts.

1 Chron. xvi, 29: "Worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness."

Psa. xxix, 2, and xcvi, 9: "O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness."

2 Chron. xx, 21: "Praise the beauty of holiness."

Holiness to the Lord was inscribed upon the priestly breastplate, mitre, and garments. Zechariah says it shall be written upon the bridles of the horses. No matter whether reference is had to the place or instruments of service, they demonstrate that God considered his service most holy. But were the worshipers "made internally as pure as the service to which they were consecrated?" Are they made so under the new dispensation? Were they debarred from that service under the old; and are they forbidden to enter upon the service under the new, until the one had, and the other has, attained "perfected holiness," or become "internally as pure as the service?" No more will they be denied entrance into heaven and participation in its holy services, until they become, or are "made internally as pure as the

service." The spirituality of all worship to God, in every age and place, is equally holy. The same God is worshiped by the same subjects, and the spiritual worship must be the same. If man cannot enter heaven until he is perfected in holiness internally, then Christ has died in vain, and the race is irretrievably lost.

This theory is in antagonism to the whole plan of salvation; invented to sustain a false premise, an incorrect definition.

My second proposition now claims attention.

The terms "holy," "most holy," and "holiness," when attributed to man and things, signify judicial or imputed holiness, and not the attainment of actual internal perfection in holiness; and this judicial or imputed holiness is the consequent of consecration.

It has already been seen that this is true in the Old Testament. It is also true in the New.

Judicial holiness or imputed righteousness is included in justification.

Confession of Faith, ch. xi, sec. 1: "Those whom God calleth (and who obey the call), he also freely justifieth; not by *infusing righteousness into them*, but by pardoning their sins, and by *accounting and accepting their persons as righteous*; not for *anything wrought in them*, or done by *them*, but for Christ's sake alone; not by imputing faith itself, the act of believing, or any other evangelical obedience to them as their righteousness; but by imputing the obedience and sanctification of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on him and his righteousness by faith."

ANALYSIS.—1. God calls.

2. Man must obey the call, or consecrate himself.

3. God pardons and accepts, and accounts their persons as righteous, not for *anything wrought in them*, not by infusing righteous or holiness into them, not for anything done by them, not by evangelical obedience, "but by imputing the obedience and sanctification of Christ unto them."

This certainly is plain enough.

The terms "righteous" and "righteousness," are here synonymous with "holiness." This is evident—

I. From the negative sentences employed.

1. "Not by infusing righteousness into them."
2. "Not for anything *wrought in them*" by any agency.
3. "Not for anything done by them."
4. "Not by imputing faith itself," an external exercise or act.
5. "Or any other evangelical obedience."

II. It is evident from the positive sentences.

1. Pardoning their sins; a judicial act, resulting in an internal consciousness.

2. By accounting and accepting their persons as righteous; a judicial act, in which, though not actually and internally as pure and perfect as his services or himself—for they are not yet regenerated—yet they are declared, accounted, regarded, treated, and accepted as holy.

"In their persons." This certainly includes the spirit, the soul, if not the body. It certainly can mean nothing less than character, perfected character, without spot, wrinkle, blemish, or any such thing.

3. "But by *imputing* the *obedience* and *sanctification* of Christ unto them."

Does man need a more perfected holiness or obedience? Is not his title to the inheritance of the saints perfect and absolute?

4. This is done "for Christ's sake alone."

5. The proof-texts cited by the compilers, include sanctification, whatever it may signify.

Heb. x, 10, 14: "By the which will we *are* sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all. For by one offering he hath *perfected* forever *them* that *are* sanctified." (See also Isa. LIII, 4-6, 10-12.)

6. They include the instruments of sanctification.

1. Peter i, 2, 19: "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through *sanctification* of the *Spirit*, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." "But with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot."

And because he is without blemish and spot, but is holy,

harmless, undefiled, and separate from sin, so his people are in him.

Col. I, 21, 22: "And you, that were sometimes alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death, to present *you holy* and *unblamable* and *unreprovable* in his sight."

All this the compilers of our Confession of Faith and of the Westminster Confession, understood to be included in justification—(1) pardon, (2) righteousness or holiness, (3) sanctification.

I am fully sustained, then, by these authorities, when I say holiness, as used in the Scriptures, referring to man, is not internal purity or perfected spiritual holiness, but is judicial holiness. Men are so regarded and treated for the sake of Christ alone; and they are so regarded in him, because they have in humble faith consecrated themselves to his services; given themselves as his sacerdotes—sacred gifts.

Consecration comes first in order, and then holiness as its consequent. So the Confession of Faith teaches, and so its authors understood it.

But there is higher authority than the Confession of Faith, however venerable and "time-honored;" the infallible word of God, and to that we now appeal.

The New Testament usage conforms to the usage of the Old.

1. The term "holy" is predicated of the persons of the Godhead one hundred and seven times, and four times to unfallen spirits. Its meaning in these applications is not under discussion.

2. It is attributed to things without life and incapable of moral purity, thirty-six times.

3. To the Church in the aggregate, all God's people or disciples, sixteen times. They are called a holy priesthood, once.

4. All believers are called saints, sanctified, holy ones, sixty-one times.

5. To children, once. (1 Cor. vii, 14.)

6. Unmarried women, once. (1 Cor. vii, 34.)
7. To pious women, once. (1 Peter iii, 5.)
8. What a bishop should be, once. (Titus i, 8.)
9. The prophets collectively, six times.
10. Every male child, once. (Luke ii, 23, quoted from the Old Testament.)

Is not the usage an exact copy of the Old Testament? Is it not evident that holiness in these connections is judicial holiness, or that secured in justification?

Holiness occurs thirteen times, and is ascribed to Deity, twice, that our proposition does not include; to the worship of God and things without life, ten times; to truth, once. Again an exact copy of the olden usage.

The phrase "most holy," is ascribed to places of worship three times; to faith, once—"most holy faith." Again the usage is the same.

The conclusion is irresistible that these terms do not imply internal holiness, but judicial holiness, when applied to man or things.

An examination of all the passages in the New Testament, in which the terms "sanctify" and "sanctification" and "holy," "most holy," and "holiness" occur, sustains the position that sanctification primarily signifies consecration, and that judicial holiness is the consequent of consecration.

Sanctify occurs six times, sanctifieth four times, sanctified fourteen times, and sanctification five times.

The first time the verb occurs is in Matt. xxiii, 17, 19, and refers to things, as sanctifying and being sanctified, temple, altar, gold, and gift. The reference in Heb. ix, 15, is also to things, as sanctifying, "the blood of bulls," etc., and needs no comment to show that simple consecration is meant, and their holiness is only judicial, the result of their consecration.

John x, 36, and xvii, 17, 19, are to be taken together.
1. The Father sanctified the Son, or set him apart to the whole work of redemption. 2. The Son consecrated himself to that appointment. 3. Christ prays that all his disciples may be sanctified. That is, as the Father hath sent him and consecrated him, and as he consecrates himself to the work

of man's redemption, so they should be consecrated to the same work. 18: "*As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world.*" Evidently for the same purpose; his consecration must be theirs. They are to be sanctified "by the word," which alone regenerates and makes internally pure no one. The evident meaning is: *As I have been set apart by thee to redeem man, and have set myself apart to the same object, so set them apart for the same purpose.* Christ could not employ the same word in two consecutive sentences with a different signification.

Acts xx, 32; xxvi, 18: "The inheritance among all them which are sanctified," is the thought of both passages.

The instrument of sanctification is faith. All Christians are the subjects of sanctification, and the inheritance is heaven or salvation.

Rom. xv, 16: "That the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost."

The Gentiles having been preached to by Paul, are influenced by the Holy Ghost to consecrate themselves to God. Hodge says: "In this beautiful passage, we see the nature of the only priesthood which belongs to the Christian ministry. It is not their office to make atonement for sin, or to offer a propitiatory sacrifice to God, but by the preaching of the gospel, to bring men, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, to offer themselves as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God."

Another says: "As a priest of the Great High Priest, Paul preached the gospel to the *nations*, and *they influenced by the Spirit, offered themselves as a whole burnt offering to God.*"

1 Cor. i, 2: "Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in *Christ Jesus*, called *saints*."

1. The whole Church at Corinth are *now* sanctified, now saints, holy ones. 2. They are sanctified in Christ.

Lange says: "By this the Church of God is distinctly characterized in its members as Christians. It is composed of persons who are sanctified; that is, *separated* from the

mass of sinful humanity, the world, and devoted to the exclusive service of the true God; and whose guilt has been expiated by an atonement. Both ideas, those of consecration and expiation, are included in the verb *hagiazēin*, to sanctify."

Yet this is the verb which means primarily "to make internally as pure as the service of God;" and this learned commentator says it means, (1) consecration and (2) expiation.

1 Cor. i, 30: "Who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption."

Lange says that the literal rendering is, "*was made unto us.*" The term rendered "sanctification" is the famed *hagiasmos*, which we are told primarily means the act of making holy internally—"was made unto us sanctification." Then it is a past act, no future progress. If sanctification means holiness or internal purity, we have it in Christ, and need no further purification. But he "unto us righteousness," which, according to our Confession of Faith, and also the Westminster Confession, is the synonym of judicial holiness, or the act of making internally pure. But if it means his perfect consecration for us, as our expiation, then our imperfect execution of our consecration is provided for in him, and we can "enter heaven" through him; for he was made unto us sanctification and redemption.

1 Cor. vi, 11: "But ye are washed; ye are sanctified."

It has already been stated that the verba "washed" and "sanctified," are in the middle voice in the Greek, and mean: Ye have washed yourselves; ye have sanctified yourselves. If sanctification be internal holiness and moral purity, it is already attained; and they have *made themselves* thus. It cannot mean regeneration, nor can it be growth in grace, for either action is finished.

Lange says: "The washing refers to their baptism. Ye have sanctified yourselves, cannot be supposed to denote the inward, progressive sanctification accomplished by the Spirit, but as in 1, 2, the act of personal consecration to God." That is, the public profession of personal consecration.

After their consecration, they were "justified in the name

of the Lord Jesus Christ; *i. e.*, pardoned and judicially pronounced holy.

1 Cor. vii, 14: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are (*hagioi*) they holy."

Lange says: "This is not to be construed subjectively; for the sanctifying principle of faith is wanting; nor does it point to future conversion anticipated, but it does denote the *Christian theocratic consecration*."²

Eph. v, 26; Heb. x, 10, 14, 29; XIII, 12, are of the same general import, and may be considered jointly.

Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word. "Wherefore Jesus that he might sanctify the people with his own blood suffered without the gate."

By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all. For by one offering, he hath perfected forever them that are sanctified. *Sanctificati sumus*, in the Vulgate, and *hagiasmonoi esmen*, in the Greek—them that have been sanctified.

"Who hath trodden under foot the Son of God, and hath counted the blood of the covenant, wherewith he was sanctified, an unholy thing, and hath done despite to the Spirit of grace."

An analysis of these quotations gives the following truths:

1. The subjects sanctified.

(1) The Church. (2) The people. (3) All believers.
(4) Unbelievers or apostates.

2. The sanctifier is Jesus.

3. The instrumentalities by which he sanctifies.

(1) "The washing of water by the word."

(2) "With his blood or by his death."

4. This sanctification is by the will or in accordance with the counsel of the Father.

5. The sanctification is finished, perfected.

"Sanctified," "have been sanctified," "he hath forever perfected them that have been sanctified."

"The blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified." This does not harmonize with the internal purity and progressive holiness theory.

1. Neither the washing of water by the word nor the death of Christ confer or beget internal holiness. 2. The subjects sanctified exclude internal purity—(1) collective bodies; (2) unbelievers or apostates. 3. There is no progression. Lange comments thus on these several texts:

"He hath perfected forever"—a once completed sacrifice. The perfect *teleiothen*, in connection with the present participle *hagiasmenous*, shows that here the reference is not to the subjective perfection of *Christians*, *reaching to the end of life*; but to the translation of those who have become subjects of the high priestly work of Christ, into that condition of perfection objectively and eternally valid in the sight of God, which the law, with its numerous and perpetually recurring rites and offerings was unable to secure."

In other words, the sanctification referred to in these passages is not internal holiness, but a state or condition which is eternally valid in God's account. What is this objective holiness but judicial holiness, or that secured in our justification? For he continues: "It is not internal holiness, but the one perfect offering of Christ, which has placed the believer in a condition in which he needs no more sacrifice for sin." And this is a state of justification; sins pardoned and the righteousness of Christ placed to our credit.

On x, 10, he says: "The *hagiasmenois esmen* express not one subjective (internal) sanctification, but one objective reception into true relationship to God, and into the actual fellowship of the members of the people of God as the *hagioi*. The mediator of this relationship is Christ, 'ho hagiazon,' the sanctifier. (Heb. ii, 11.) Both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren. On the basis of Christ's sanctification, the consecration of the Church is eternally valid. Consecration first, then the cleansing, 'that he might sanctify and cleanse it.' 27. 'That he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or

wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish.'"

1 Thess. iv, 3, 4: "For this is the will of God even your sanctification, that ye should abstain from fornication: that *every one* of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honor."

Here sanctification consists in abstaining from fornication and the observance of conjugal chastity. In the previous verse he exhorted them to separate themselves from indulgences in lusts, and now tells them it is the will of God that you separate from fornication, and that *every one* possess your own wives in chastity and honor, and not in the *lust* of concupiscence. How this text can be tortured into internal holiness, or the process of perfecting internal purity, I cannot comprehend.

1 Thess. v, 23: "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

The apostle exhorted them in the preceding verses to many practical duties, and now prays, May the God of peace consecrate you wholly to these duties, and preserve you blameless in their discharge. This must be the sense if the latter clause be exegetical of the first.

But it is not by any means certain that the second clause is exegetical of the first.

The two clauses contain two distinct thoughts: sanctification and preservation. If the phrase "sanctify you wholly," means perfected internal holiness, and the second clause be explanatory of the first, then the apostle prays not only for their freedom from sin, but also for the destruction of the sinful nature; for to be perfectly holy is to be as God and angels and the saved in heaven—destitute of sinful natures. Then where is the necessity for the second clause? for once perfected, they are holy forever; and the second clause would be an unnecessary and vain repetition.

Again, the orthodox who say the first clause is explained by the second, and sanctify wholly man's perfected purity, admit this state cannot be attained in this life; but is

obtained only after the death of the animal nature; the cessation of the operations of its instincts, or the old nature, ever at war with the good and new nature; and the corruption and dissolution of the body, the medium of the old nature.

Evidently holding that sanctification, perfected soul-purity, is not mere sinlessness, but also the thorough destruction of the sinful or old nature; for nothing unholy can enter heaven; and thus a writer in one of our periodicals explains it. The soul-purity is not perfect before death, and cannot be; but "at death the old nature ceases to act and the conflict ceases." This is true as regards subjective and internal holiness, but not of judicial holiness. But applying it to the text, and the apostle logically prays for the death of these Thessalonian brethren by the wholesale in one clause, and their preservation in the next until the coming of Christ. But the prayer of the apostle is evidently confined to this life. "Preserve you blameless until the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ in spirit, soul, and body." That coming was an event which he believed was near at hand, and he prayed for something he believed attainable in this life—not for something to be reached only after the coming of Christ. If the sanctification of which he speaks be perfected internal holiness, then the "holiness people" are right when they say it is attainable in this life; and if attainable, why may not their claim to possess it, and that they are as pure and holy as Jesus Christ himself, be true? for certainly to be perfectly holy in their "whole spirit, soul, and body," is to be as pure as the humanity of Christ was and is. It cannot be, therefore, that sanctification means making internally pure. It is consecration, and their whole consecration is that for which the apostle prays in the first clause.

Again: but if it be perfected holiness, and that be attainable in this life, then the apostle prays for something for others which was denied himself, and which he says, in the last days of his life, he had not attained—for something contrary to his own experience and that of all Bible characters, even the most saintly. He prays, according to the

internal holiness theory, for a moral impossibility. Could one guided by the Spirit offer such a prayer? Yet this false definition of the term "sanctify," logically leads to a conclusion revolting to every pious heart. The premise must be wrong. Writers and commentators, eminent for piety and learning, think that in this and other passages a trichotomy in man is recognized—the spirit, the soul, and the body; the spirit being that which is usually called the soul, and the soul in this connection representing his animal nature and instincts, and the body his material part. Man evidently possesses a nature in common with the lower animals, distinct from, yet inseparably connected both with the body and the soul. But is the body and the animal life, with its instincts, susceptible of moral quality and essential holiness? If so, all the lower animals and all material objects are, and the Indian's faithful dog may be his companion in the happy hunting grounds. But this is contrary to the intelligence of man, and hence a false definition leads us again to the *reductio ad absurdum*.

"To sanctify wholly" cannot mean moral quality, if the second clause be exegetical of the first, because the term "blameless" is not the equivalent of internal holiness, or even of regeneration. Worcester defines blameless thus: "A blameless character, or reputation, is one that is free from censure; a spotless, or unspotted character, is one against which no charge has been brought." Hence, the apostle, after his discussion of the justification and freedom of the children of God, exclaims: "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." Though not perfected in holiness, not as pure as God's service, nor as pure internally as angels, yet they are blameless, and no charge can be brought against them, for they are pardoned and judicially holy. A child may be blameless, yet neither regenerated nor perfected in moral purity.

Consecration and preservation naturally and logically remove all difficulties. The apostle first prays for their entire consecration. 2. That they may be preserved harmless, uninjured, in all the trials, persecutions, and perils of the great apostasy which, previous to the coming of Christ,

he tells them shall take place; that their spirits may be strong to endure and suffer no contamination—their lives may be preserved and their bodies unhurt. This is natural. It is God's order of antecedent and consequent. Full, entire consecration in faith first, then justification, then regeneration and salvation by his power. "None shall ever pluck them out of my hand." "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect. It is God that justifieth."

II. 1 Thess. ii, 13; 1 Peter i, 2: "But we are bound to give thanks always to God for you, brethren beloved of the Lord; because God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth." "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."

ANALYSIS.—1. Their election to salvation from the beginning, an event which has already transpired.

2. The agencies of sanctification: (1) the Spirit's, (2) the belief of the truth, (3) the purposes of this election; salvation, and obedience, and all the benefits of the atonement.

Upon the basis of the expiatory death of Jesus, God the Father elects them to salvation, they, influenced by the Spirit, having consecrated themselves unto obedience.

But if the sanctification of the Spirit be regeneration, or perfected holiness, or internal purity, or the process thereof, then Calvinism is true, when it teaches that man is passive in regeneration, and faith is the product of the renewed heart, and not the condition precedent; for the agency of the Spirit comes first, and the belief of the truth afterwards, in the text.

But if it means that under the influence of the Spirit, they believed and voluntarily consecrated themselves unto obedience, then faith occupies its appropriate place and fills its own office.

See remarks on Rom. xv, 16.

Lange's comments on 1 Peter i, 2: "This comprises all the gracious influences of the Holy Ghost, from his first gentle wooings to the sealing of grace. Salvation is the work of the Trinity. It is a work participated in by the

three persons of the Godhead, and redounds to their glory. God the Father elects to salvation in Christ, and prepares salvation; God the Son gives reality to election by his *life, sufferings, and death*; God the Holy Ghost *appropriates* (consecrates) and *applies* to the souls of penitent sinners the salvation procured by Jesus Christ. He that places himself under the discipline of the Holy Ghost, and suffers himself to form the resolution, ‘All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient, as did Israel of old,’ is mysteriously sprinkled with the blood of Jesus Christ; *his sins are covered, he is regarded as pure and holy in Christ.*’ (What is this but justification, pardon, and judicial holiness?) “And he is enabled to render priestly service to God, and to be found *without spot before him.*

See Confession of Faith, ch. xi, and proof-texts.

Jude 1: “To them that are (have been) sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called.”

The whole Church is addressed as the *hagiasmenois*, the *sanctificatis*, the already sanctified; not a process yet to be completed.

I have passed through the examination of every passage in the Old and New Testament, written in four languages, and the result is, the primary meaning is in every case to consecrate, and judicial holiness is its consequent. In no instance does it mean to make internally pure, or to confer abstract holiness. In no case does it mean to regenerate, nor progress in internal holiness. It is uniformly a completed, finished, and perfected act. In no case is it applied to individuals in the sense of internal holiness. Generally, almost universally, when applied to men, it is to bodies, Churches, a whole community of Christians, to the entire communion of saints. It is applied to things inanimate and without moral quality, and without spirit, in the same signification as to men. Not the shadow of distinction in its use is intimated.

Enough has, perhaps, been already written to demonstrate the second proposition; yet I propose further demonstration.

Of the words, “holy” and “most holy,” nothing more need be said; but of the word “holiness,” as used in the

New Testament, the following is submitted: It is used twice of the God-head. There is no dispute concerning this term, as it is not contained in the second proposition. Ten times it is said of the service of God, and, of course, can not mean internal purity or perfected holiness in man.

Luke i, 74, 75: "That he would grant unto us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life."

The old Mosaic service is referred to. The word translated "holiness" is not the disputed *hagiasmos*, but a different word, which Barnes and Lange render "piety;" and Liddell and Scott's lexicon, "divine or natural law, justice; hence, objectively, religious observances—subjectively, piety, reverence."

Eph. iv, 24: The word rendered "true holiness" is the same as above; and, in the original, is the holiness of truth, both in the Greek and the Vulgate.

Acts iii, 12: The original word here is *eusebia*, and Liddell and Scott define it "reverence, reverential love and behavior;" and it is translated "godliness" in fourteen places in the New Testament.

Rom. i, 4; 2 Cor. vii, 1; Thess. iii, 13: In these, *hagiasmos* is not the Greek term, but a kindred word, rendered "sanctification." Barnes makes it "the perpetual striving for holiness, though unattainable in life;" Lange, "the faithful execution of consecration."

1 Thess. iii, 13: Lange, "Holiness, the result of sanctification or consecration."

Lange makes faith the beginning principle of holiness, or consecration; and consecration must be faithfully carried out during the whole life, and is only completed at death. What is this but growth in grace?

Tit. ii, 8: *Hieroprepes* is the word, which Liddell and Scott define, "becoming a sacred place, person, or matter. Lange: "Becoming saints, and refers to aged females generally, not only in their apparel, but also their whole deportment."

In Eph. v, 3, "as becometh saints" is the idea.

1 Tim. ii, 10: Adorning of women. "Which becometh women professing godliness."

In Heb. xii, 10; 2 Cor. i, 12, a different word occurs.

Lange says: "The idea is that of a religious purity arising from the unreserved surrender of the heart to God." Consecration first, then external conduct.

In none of these is holiness internal perfection, but religious service and conduct.

Hagiasmos is translated "holiness" five times.

Liddell and Scott define it to be "consecration, sanctification,"—making them synonymous, and refers to Rom. vi, 19. Lange renders it "sanctification." "Completed holiness is not the preliminary condition for beholding the Lord, but its fruit. *Hagiasmos* can not mean a striving; otherwise, we would have to translate, 'Strive, after the striving of holiness.'"

Basil makes it "thorough consecration to God." Lange says, this is the sense, and gives an instance of its use in the classics, and in the Septuagint. Tholuch: "The condition of being thoroughly consecrated." Which does not harmonize with the theory of progressive or completed holiness. This rendering—consecration—says Lange's translators, Schaff and others, accords with the text. "In verse 22, the issue of sanctification or consecration is perfect holiness."

1 Thess. iv, 7: *Hagiasmos*—"For God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness."

The contrast is here between heathen practices and indulgence in lusts and holiness, or the external conduct of Christians.

Lange says: "The apostle does not think of sanctification as a gradual subduing of the flesh, but, it is, for him, separation from the world for God—they being made partakers of his spirit."

1 Tim. ii, 15: "Continue in faith, and charity, and holiness, with sobriety."

This refers to woman's salvation in child-bearing, and the holiness refers to the preceding directions he had given concerning them. Certainly it does not refer to internal holiness, as limited by sobriety.

Heb. xii, 14. See remarks on Rom. vi, 19.

Thus, in no case does it signify internal purity or holiness, nor progress therein.

CONCLUSION.

God's plan for the salvation of man is grand but simple. Like himself, it is perfect. Practically, it is the same in all its parts to every repentant believer. All are saved in the same way.

1. The sanctification or election of the Father comes first, which is his counsel of love and mercy toward the race, in the expiation and righteousness provided in Christ.

2. The sanctification of the Son, in the execution of the Father's counsel in his life, sufferings, and death.

3. The sanctification of the Spirit, in enlightening, convicting, and influencing sinners to receive Christ and his sanctification.

4. The voluntary consecration or sanctification of the penitent, believing sinner to the service of God. This consecration is entire, for all time and eternity, with no reservation or equivocation. No one was ever justified and regenerated before he sanctified or consecrated himself, soul and body, all that he is and has; the surrender of his will, his life, his all, to the will of God in Christ Jesus. Without this, the sanctification of the Father and of the Son is of no avail. God calls, but man must obey the call. Without this the sanctification of the Godhead benefits him not.

5. Justification. The sinner having made this consecration, in humble faith in Jesus, is justified. God judicially declares him absolved from the guilt of sin, and perfectly righteous and holy, by virtue of the expiatory death and the perfect holiness of Christ. He so regards him and so treats him. Thus he acquires title to heaven by virtue of his oneness with Christ.

6. Regeneration. The sinner could have no pleasure in the execution of his vow of consecration without a change of disposition—"the controlling tendency of his nature," and a change of tastes and affections. The yoke would be grievous, and the burden would be unsupportable. But God

has provided a remedy for this. The Spirit regenerates—produces this change, and then the “yoke is easy and the burden light.” Now he delights in the law of God—“old things are passed away,” and all things are new. Now he has the necessary qualification for the service, and for the enjoyment of God on earth and in heaven.

7. Growth in grace. The consecrated, justified, and regenerated sinner now proceeds to the execution and faithful performance of his consecration. He consecrated himself to obedience. His progress in this, and in the cultivation and development of the new disposition and affections; the strengthening of the new “controlling tendency of his nature,” is growth in grace. Here is ample room for development, not only in this life, but in that which is to come. Here is room for “the higher,” or rather deeper, more lowly life—even approximating the full execution of the vow of consecration. Here is imperative demand for the employment of man’s powers, and the means of grace God has given—the word, the aid of the Spirit, etc. As he more faithfully executes his consecration, “his path will become brighter and brighter unto the perfect day.” The unshadowed brightness of that day, when he shall fully execute his consecration, he will never see in time, and perhaps not in the upper sanctuary; yet he will not fail in an abundant entrance through the pearly gates into the city of his God, but only through the fulfilled execution of the consecration of his Great High Priest, who has gone in before and for him. By his death and perfect righteousness, his weary and imperfect child will reach home at last. Jesus, the Judge, will say, Come in, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world; and all the hosts of heaven will shout, Amen.

On this God-devised, Christ-executed, and Holy-Ghost-applied plan, my hope is fixed. Here is my “rest of faith;” here my “strong consolation.” In the full assurance of faith in this divine system, I will gladly toil and suffer. “For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall

be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus." "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen."

J. W. POINDEXTER.

ART. V.—LITERARY NOTICES.

SCOTCH AND IRISH SEEDS IN AMERICAN SOIL: The early history of the Scotch and Irish Churches, and their Relation to the Presbyterian Church of America, by the Rev. J. G. Craighead, D.D. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication, No. 1,334 Chestnut Street.

This is a well-written and instructive little volume of 348 pages 12mo. from the pen of Dr. Craighead, and issued by the Presbyterian Board of Publication.

The author had two objects in his mind while preparing the volume. "First, to show the indebtedness of the American Presbyterian Church to the churches of Scotland and Ireland for the elements which entered into its original constitution, as also for its subsequent rapid growth and influence."

"The second object was to bring into proper prominence and perspicuity the principles of religious and civil freedom for which the Presbyterians of Scotland and Ireland so long battled, and to maintain which all of them were called to endure protracted persecution, and many thousands of them to lay down their lives."

Of the 348 pages, 146 are devoted to the Church of Scotland, and 118 to the Church of Ireland. The remaining pages are devoted to the American Presbyterian Church.

The history covers a period of about two and a half centuries. These centuries gave origin to momentous events that occurred hard upon each other, many of which were intimately connected with Presbyterianism, or rather constitutes part of its history.

Of course, it was not our author's purpose to give a detailed and connected history of Presbyterianism in Scotland and Ireland, from the time of its introduction till the time of its transplantation "in American soil." It was his purpose, principally, to enumerate the fundamental principles of Presbyterianism, as contradistinguished from

other forms of church polity; to show its practical effects upon civil and religious liberty; also its effects upon public and private morals, and upon spirituality in religious worship; and to pay a becoming tribute to the memories of the many great and good men who gave their fortunes, their labors, and, in many instances, their lives to the cause of God and the God-given rights of humanity.

For reasons that can not now be considered, Scotland did not seek to free itself from the Papal yoke at the same time that England did; but the tardiness of movement was more than compensated by the thoroughness of the work when it was attempted.

The first bold advocate of the Reformation in Scotland and the first martyr, was Patrick Hamilton. His pious and patriotic labors and heroic martyrdom were succeeded by the labors and death of many a noble spirit who feared God more than men, ere the crown-rights of Jesus were fully established in Scotland.

No section of politico-ecclesiastical history is more interesting or instructive than is that of Scotland. This part of Dr. Craighead's book is full of interest, and instructive withal, but is quite too brief to be satisfactory to those who desire more than a brief outline.

Protestantism and Presbyterianism are by no means identical. The Protestantism of Scotland, probably, would have been like that of England, but for the influence of John Knox, who is justly recognized as one of Scotland's many noble sons, and who is preëminently entitled to the honor of being the father of Scotch Presbyterianism. He learned its fundamental principles at Geneva, in conference with Calvin himself. His scheme of church polity gave freedom to his country, and, as our author shows, in giving freedom to Scotland, did much for civil and religious liberty in this country.

Our author's very brief historic sketch of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland is full of interest. This was, in fact, mainly an off-shoot, or branch, of the Scotch Church.

But the portion of Dr. Craighead's little volume, in which our readers are likely to take the greatest interest, is the

part that treats of the Presbyterian Church in America. Our author (page 86) says: "Much the largest proportion of the early Presbyterian ministers in this country were from the Irish Church. They, however, were originally either natives of Scotland or descendants of those who had removed to Ireland, and, with few exceptions, were educated in Scotland. Webster states that nearly two-thirds of the ministers of the Presbyterian Church in America, previous to 1738, were graduates of Glasgow University.

Ireland received its Presbyterianism largely from Scotland, and subsequently these two elements, the Scotch and Irish, united in forming the Presbyterian Church in this country. Our author gives the names of the principal ministers and the year of their arrival, with brief hints of their characteristics, locations, labors, etc., from 1681 to 1758, a period of seventy-seven years; or from the introduction of Presbyterianism into this country till the reunion of the Synod of New York and that of Philadelphia, which event formed something of an epoch in the history of American Presbyterianism.

From this very brief notice, we collate the following statements, presuming that our readers will derive from them both profit and pleasure:

Francis Makemie, "to whom the honor has been ascribed of laying the foundation of the Presbyterian Church in this country," arrived in Maryland in 1682, or 1683. He was soon succeeded by Samuel Davis. John Frazer and Archibald Riddel came in 1685; David Simpson and John Wilson in 1686; George MacNish, and probably John Hampton, in 1705; John Boyd, 1706; James Anderson and John Henry, 1709; George Gillespie, 1712; Robert Lawson, 1713; Robert Witherspoon and John Bradner, 1714; Hugh Conn, Samuel Gelston, John Thomas, and Robert Orr, 1715; William Tennent and his three sons, Gilbert, William, and John, in 1716; Robert Cross, 1717; Henry Cook and Samuel Young, 1718; James Macgregor, accompanied with one hundred families, 1719; Robert Laing and Alex. Hutchison, 1722; Thomas Craighead, 1723; James Houston, 1724; Adam Boyd, 1725; Archibald McCook and Hugh Stevenson, 1726;

John Moorhead and Charles Beatty, 1729; William Orr, David Sankey, James Campbell, and John Williamson, 1730; John Cross and William Bertram, 1732; Samuel Blair and Benjamin Campbell, 1733; Samuel Hemphill, James Martin, Robert Jamison, and John Campbell, 1734; Francis Allison, Hugh Carlisle, and Samuel Black, 1735; John Elder and John Paul, 1736; John Craig, Samuel Tennent, and John Blair, 1737; David Alexander, 1738; Samuel Caren, David McGregor, and Francis McHenry, 1739; Alex. McDowell and James McCrea, 1741; John Steel, 1744; Andrew Bay, 1747; Samson Smith and Samuel Kennedy, 1750; Robert Smith, 1751; James Finley, 1752; John Kinkead and James Brown, 1753; Hugh Knox, 1755; Henry Patillo, 1757.

Dr. Craighead says: "At the union of the two Synods of New York and Philadelphia, in 1758, there were but ninety-four ministers connected with the Presbyterian Church in this country; and of this number, forty had come either from Ireland or Scotland. From the origin of the Church, at least ninety ministers of foreign birth had helped to plant Presbyterianism in the New World, and aided in its subsequent growth."

Again he says: "The indebtedness of the Presbyterian Church in America, therefore, to the churches of Ireland and Scotland can scarcely be overestimated; and this is as true of the membership of the Church as of the clergymen who ministered to them."

These facts show the large indebtedness of the American to the Scotch and the Irish Church, both for ministers and members. No other church in this country, it is presumed, received, during the same period, such large accessions from foreign sources.

Our author devotes a chapter to the early educational interests of this country, and shows that the Presbyterians were largely devoted to this good work. He truly represents that in Geneva, in Scotland, as also in this country and wherever Presbyterianism has been planted, the cause of education receives commendable attention. He makes laudatory mention of the leading educators of the early Presbyterian Church. The names and labors of most of

these are familiar to the country. We heartily concur with our author in awarding honor to these educators, and to the Presbyterian Church generally, for what they did, in that early period of our history, in the interest of education. The country owes them a debt of gratitude for their noble work in that regard. Still, it may not be amiss to remark, that they did no more than what both their interests and their duty required them to do. They, at that time—from 1681 to 1758, and for many years later—were the strongest church in America, outside of New England. They had the members and the resources, and upon them, in the providence of God, rested the responsibility of giving direction to the educational interests of the country. It is well for themselves, and well for the country generally, that they proved themselves, in a praise-worthy degree, equal to the task Providence had laid upon them.

The educational interests of this country generally were, from a sort of necessity, created by circumstances, in the hands of Presbyterians and Congregationalists. They were largely the officers, patrons, teachers, and beneficiaries, not only of their church schools, but also of the public schools of the country. Under the circumstances, it could not be otherwise. This state of things gave to these churches, especially to the Presbyterian, immense power and prestige, and has proven to be one of the chief elements of their denominational success. Providence gave them the opportunity, and they wisely and patriotically used it to their denominational advantage, and to the good of the whole country.

Some of the present American churches did not, at the period in question, exist at all; and others were only in their infancy, or quite too feeble to be a power in the land. Some of these have now attained to sufficient power to take charge of their own educational interests, and to become efficient factors in all the public interests of the nation.

Our author gives us a long and a very interesting chapter on the patriotism of American Presbyterians. He notices, with some particularity, the homogeneousness of Presbyterianism and Republicanism; the homogeneousness of

Prelacy and Monarchy; and the inhomogeneousness of Prelacy and Republicanism, and of Presbyterianism and Monarchy; or the fact, that civil and religious liberty, while distinct in themselves, are, in large measure, the complements of each other.

Dr. Craighead assigns quite a number of reasons—all valid and judiciously put—why American Presbyterians espoused, with self-sacrificing devotion, the cause of American independence. These reasons were equally valid with all non-prelatical churches. Prominent among these reasons are these facts, that many of them—some in Scotland and others in Ireland—had learned by bitter experience to stand in awe of the tender mercies of prelatical power, when seconded by the “royal prerogative;” also the fact that the English Government had repeatedly avowed the purpose of establishing the Episcopal power in its American colonies—a fore-taste of which had already been experienced in New York, Virginia, and in the Carolinas. These reasons, had there been no others, were sufficient to cause the non-Episcopal churches to favor the cause of American independence. Parenthetically, we believe there is no conclusive evidence that any one of the American churches, if it had possessed overwhelming power over all the others, and had been able at the same time to free itself from the British yoke, would have favored universal religious toleration. The conduct of the New England churches, and the ecclesiastical intolerance of the Synod of New York and that of Philadelphia towards each other, suggest a contrary presumption. It is probable, at least it seems so to us, that universal religious toleration in this country had its origin in policy, rather than in any clear and general conviction that God alone is Lord of the conscience.

Our author gives to Presbyterians the chief prominence and the chief merits in the patriotic efforts of the colonies to achieve independence. They were conspicuous wherever duty called or patriotism required a sacrifice. They were prominent in the conventions, in Congress, in the army, as officers and privates, in patriotic and self-sacrificing toils and

privations at home. We, however, have not space for further details.

The book is well-adapted to the end for which it is intended, viz: to give the reader a favorable view of Presbyterianism. The author admits that Presbyterians have committed blunders, but does not specify them. If he had done this, and attached censure where it belongs, while awarding praise where it is merited, his interesting little volume would have been less liable to the criticism of *one-sidedness*. We have no hesitancy in recommending the book to those who wish a brief work on the subject of which it treats.

FROM EGYPT TO PALESTINE. Through Sinai, The Wilderness and The South Country. Observations of a journey made with special reference to the History of the Israelites, by S. C. Bartlett, D.D., LL. D., President of Dartmouth College, and lately Professor in the Chicago Theological Seminary. With maps and illustrations. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Of course every traveler in the old world must write a book, and it must be remembered that the last book of travels is always the most reliable. Each traveler, too, knows exactly what everything he sees in the old world means, its place in history, etc.

Sometimes we are amused and then disgusted with the accurate knowledge and the amount of information which some of these tourists have pretended to pick up in so short a time. They may not know much about the history of their own country, or of their own church, or of their own men, but in a few months they can pass over several thousand years of the history of the Old World, and tell us all about each place and everything.

Although much has been written by travelers which is worthless and exceedingly unreliable, yet it is good that so many give to the world the benefit of their knowledge. In this way ancient history gets its most substantial verification, and is clothed with constantly increasing interest, while each traveler and explorer turns up something new. So tourists who give us the benefit of their diary or notes,

are public benefactors, and especially is this true when it is by a thoughtful, Christian scholar, earnestly in search of truth. Among this class we certainly, and with pleasure, rank our author.

We are sorry that Dr. Bartlett does not tell us when he started, and how long a time he spent in making his investigations. We cannot find out exactly when the tour was made, nor how long it took him, except that he journeyed about a year and was in Alexandria in December. This, we think, would give the reader more pleasure in following him, if not a better idea of his investigations. There are other things, however, we are constantly wishing he had told, and so we suppose it would have been if he had written a much larger book.

He tells us, in his preface, that the book and the journey "were undertaken with a somewhat definite purpose." He was accompanied by Rev. Jacob Chamberlain, M.D., missionary in India, Rev. E. M. Williams, of Minneapolis, and Edward J. Bartlett, A.M., of Chicago, now Professor in Dartmouth College. The party, after reaching Rome, went to Alexandria, from which point they began their journey. We then have chapters under the following heads, which will convey an idea, at least, to our readers the route taken and the investigations made by our tourists: Giving first a chapter on Rome and its Antiquities, he leads off, To the East; Egypt and the Nile; Pharaoh; Traces of Contact between Israel and Egypt; The Land of Goshen; The Exodus; The wells of Moses, Marah and Elim; The Encampment by the Sea and the Wilderness of Sin; Egyptian Mines and the Written Valley; Wadies Feiran and Hebran, Mounts Serbral and Sinai; The Region of the Law-Giving; The Mysterious Encampment; The Northern Route, by Sarabit El Khadri; The Desert of the Wandering; The South Country; Through the South Country to Beersheba; The Hill Country of Judah; The Holy City; To Jericho; The Line of Joshua's March; Through the Battlefields of Palestine; From Nazareth to Gennesaret; On and Around the Sea of Galilee; From Gennesaret to the Coasts of Tyre and Sidon; Coming Out of Antiqui'y and the East.

Thus we have a minute description of points and matters of interest from Alexandria to Beyrouth. The book is interesting and instructive from beginning to end. It is well written—an easy, racy style; scholarly, but not pedantic. The reader will not get so much valuable information as from Thompson's "Land and the Book," and really it is intended to answer a different purpose from that book, but, upon the whole, it is one of the best books of its kind we have read.

It has fifty-five illustrations and nine maps. Most of the illustrations we think good, and especially do we like the maps. The maps are as follows: Eastern Egypt and the Route of Israel; Red Sea Crossing, showing the various theories; Wady Maghara; The Dead Sea; Valley of Esdrælon; Valley of Nazareth; Sea of Galilee; Environs of Jerusalem; Sinai, the Desert, and the South Country. Notable among these maps is the last named, being, as far as we can judge, a good map of that very interesting country.

The book is well printed, with large, clear type, and on good paper. It is tastily and well bound in cloth, and we think as good press work as we have seen anywhere. Upon the whole we are pleased with the book, and cordially recommend it to Bible students, and to all who are fond of reading travels and in search of truth. It is entitled to a place in any library.

A BLOW AT THE ROOT OF MODERN INFIDELITY AND SCEPTICISM;
or, Huxleyism Analyzed and Critised, by Thomas Morrow,
V.D.M., Morgan County, Alabama.

This is a pamphlet of sixty pages, well and earnestly written, on a subject of great interest. It is directed against Huxleyism in particular, but generally against the class of opinions and doctrines which Huxleyism is very properly considered to represent. Without any great amount of pretension, coming to us in pamphlet form, it is a well directed and heavy blow. The author is unknown to fame, but he evidently understands himself. He understands more than himself; he has looked into the subject of which he treats. Scientist are very outspoken; they seem to have settled the question to their satisfaction that *they are the men, and that*

wisdom will die with them. We think they are very much mistaken. Wisdom and truth have survived many a storm; we think they will survive the present tempest which would sweep away our foundation from beneath our feet. Gold may need the furnace as a purifier, but the fire destroys nothing but the alloy. The gold comes forth all the purer. We have no doubt that truth will come forth from this contest all the purer, freed from its alloy and shining with greater clearness and brilliancy. Our author promises us a book which is to be a "Thesaurus" on this general subject. We shall welcome his book when it comes. This welcome we promise in advance. We hope it will be a worthy successor of a "Blow at the Root."

THE ORATOR'S MANUAL; a Practical and Philosophical Treatise on Vocal Culture, Emphasis, and Gesture, by George L. Raymond, M.A., Professor of Oratory in Williams College, Massachusetts. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1880.

This is quite an extensive treatise on vocal culture and gesture, and contains a varied and excellent selection of extracts from the classic literature of the English language. Not only teachers of oratory, but teachers of reading in the common and higher schools will find it a valuable acquisition. Although the book is small, it contains a great deal of matter, and we think will prove entirely satisfactory to those who may use it.

CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION AND EXPERIENCE, by Rev. William I. Gill, A.M. New York: Authors' Publishing Company. Pp. 238.

Mr. Gill was, and we suppose is yet, a member of the Newark Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. A few years ago he wrote a book on "Evolution and Progress," and thereby brought himself into trouble with his conference, but after some debate and a little more sensation, his character was passed. We see nothing objectionable in the little book before us. The style of some of its chapters is rather sophmoric, and in one or two instances, a little too vituperative. The book is a contribution to

the theistic literature of the day, and may be read by many with profit.

THE CROSS, by Charles F. Richardson. Philadelphia: B. J. Lippincott & Co.

This is a volume of thirty-nine sacred lyrics, printed on thirty-nine pages. While they show no particular evidence of genius in the author, they contain some very pleasant verses. Worthy of notice among these hymns, are those whose titles are, Faith, Service, Patience, Humility, and Joy. The publishers have done their part admirably.

ROBERT'S RULES OF ORDER FOR DELIBERATIVE ASSEMBLIES. Pocket size. Post paid, 75 cts. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co.

We take pleasure in recommending this manual of parliamentary rules. It is one of the best, if not superior to anything of the kind, we have ever seen. It has a table, covering two pages, which is itself worth the price of the book. Two hundred rules are conveniently arranged in this table, so that almost any question of parliamentary usage can be determined without turning a leaf.

THE EARL OF MAYFIELD. "*Fates et Fidelis.*" Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros.

This is a well written novel, of some fascination. The scene is laid in Louisiana during the late war between the States, and the closing scene in England. The moral of this novel is not, perhaps, bad, but such literature is not healthy food, either for the intellectual or moral nature, and the less we have of it the better for society.

THE ROUGAN-MACQUART FAMILY, by Emile Zola. Translated from the French by John Stirling. Philadelphia: T. B. Peterson & Bros.

We sometimes find pure and chaste sentiments, as well as elegant and beautifull language, in writings of fiction, but we would hardly go to French novels for lessons in morals, and especially this one.

[Other books have been received, which will be noticed in the July number.]

5



SCHOOLS.

Cumberland University.

This Institution is complete in all its departments. It has a thorough Preparatory School, with five instructors; a Collegiate Department, with four professors; a Theological School, with five professors and instructors.

EXPENSES.

Preparatory School	\$20.00
Freshman and Sophomore Classes, each	20.00
Junior and Senior Classes, each	25.00
Law School	50.00
Contingent fee	5.00
Boarding per week, in families	3.50
In clubs	\$1.25 to 2.00

Candidates for the ministry are received free of charge.

Students in the Theological School are charged a matriculation fee of \$5.00, in addition to the contingent fee.

For catalogues, or further information, address,

N. GREEN, Chancellor,
LEBANON, TENN.

Lincoln University, LINCOLN, ILLINOIS.

This Institution is carrying into effect, under proper restrictions, the co-education of young ladies and gentlemen, and is believed to be equal to the best colleges and seminaries in the land.

Besides the regular Preparatory and Collegiate Departments, it affords ample facilities for instruction in Painting, Penmanship, Modern Languages, and Elocution; and has connected with it a Conservatory of Music, in which all branches of this science are taught. Students completing the course prescribed in the Conservatory will receive diplomas.

GOOD BOARDING

can be obtained in private families from \$3.00 to \$5.50 per week, and in clubs from \$2.00 to \$2.25.

For catalogues, or any particulars, address,

A. J. MCGLUMPHY, D.D., President,
63 LOGAN ST.

THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL OF CUMBERLAND UNIVERSITY.

FACULTY.

N. GREEN, LL.D., Chancellor.

R. BEARD, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology.

S. G. BURNEY, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature.

R. V. FOSTER, Professor of Hebrew and New Testament Greek.

LECTURES delivered during the Winter months: On Pastoral Work, by A. J. Baird, D.D.; on Mission Work, by J. R. Brown, D.D.

Waynesburg College,

WAYNESBURG, PA.

BOTH SEXES ADMITTED.

A Live Institution,

UNSURPASSED IN

Healthfulness of Location,
Thoroughness of Instruction,
Economy of Expense,
and Moral Tone,
affording the most desirable facilities for
acquiring a thorough

English and Classical Education,

At the Least Possible Expense.

Winter term begins January 7, 1880.

Spring term begins March 31, 1880.

Fall term begins September 8, 1880.

For fuller information address

A. B. MILLER, D.D., President.

Trinity University.

Rev. W. E. BEESON, D.D., President.

A Full Corps of First-Class Teachers.

Classical, Scientific, and Commercial Courses.

MUSIC AND MODERN LANGUAGES

BY THE BEST TEACHERS.

THE INSTITUTION IS FOR BOTH

MALE AND FEMALE.

CHARGES MODERATE.

TEHUCANA is one of the healthiest locations in Texas.

For particulars address the President,

TEHUCANA,
LIMESTONE CO., TEXAS.

MINISTERS and others who feel an interest in the circulation of the QUARTERLY, are earnestly solicited to act as agents.

No subscription will be taken for a less time than one year, and the back numbers of the volume will, in all cases, be sent whenever it is practicable to do so. Price per single copy, *in advance*, Two Dollars per annum. An extra copy to any one sending a club of three.

Subscribers changing their post-office address are requested to give notice to the Publisher.

The editors do not hold themselves responsible for all the views of their correspondents. No writer, however, will be permitted to express sentiments subversive of any of the fundamental doctrines of the Scriptures. Free discussion will be tolerated in the pages of the QUARTERLY, provided a dignified and Christian spirit is maintained.

Money should be sent by Check, Post-office Order, Draft, or Express. Otherwise the remittance will be at the sender's risk.

All matter for publication, and all matters of business connected with the QUARTERLY, should be sent to the publisher,

REV. J. D. KIRKPATRICK,
LEBANON, TENN. -